

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY



129 422

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY

THE REFERENCE SHELF

is published to make available when needed good debates, collections of articles, briefs, bibliographies and study outlines on timely subjects for public discussion. Each number is devoted to a single subject and, unless otherwise noted, contains briefs, references and selected articles. To make the material available at the time of greatest need, publication is irregular. Each volume contains ten or more separate issues, about 1500 pages in all, and now covers a year in time. Single numbers, 90c unless otherwise noted.

The Reference Shelf is entered in the Readers' Guide to Periodical Literature, Education Index, Industrial Arts Index, Cumulative Book Index, and Book Review Digest.

Volume II. \$2.40

- | | |
|---|--|
| No. | No. |
| 4. French Occupation of the Ruhr. (Oxford-Bates debate, with briefs, references and reprints) | 10. Recognition of Soviet Russia
J. G. Hodgson. |
| 7. Soldiers' Bonus. J. E. Johnsen | <i>See also University Debaters' Annual, 1923-24; 1930-31, 1931-32; Recognition of Russia.</i> |
| 9. Superpower. L. T. Beman. | |



Volume III. \$2.40

- | | |
|--|--|
| No. | No. |
| 2. A Labor Party for the United States. J. G. Hodgson. | 8. Metric System J. E. Johnsen. |
| 4. Japanese Exclusion. J. E. Johnsen.
<i>See also University Debaters' Annual, 1924-25. p. 75-119</i> | 10. Outlawing the Pistol. L. T. Beman. |

Volume IV. \$3.00

- | | |
|---|--|
| No. | No. |
| 1. Government Regulation of the Coal Industry. J. E. Johnsen.
<i>See also University Debaters' Annual, 1925-26 p. 51-93</i> | 7. Special Legislation for Women.
J. E. Johnsen.
<i>See also University Debaters' Annual, 1926-27. Ch. VIII.</i> |
| 4. St. Lawrence River Ship Canal.
J. E. Johnsen. | |
| 5. Federal Department of Education.
J. E. Johnsen
<i>See also Handbook, Ser. II, Vol. 2 and University Debaters' Annual, 1925-26. p. 95-142</i> | 10. Questions of the Hour. (Study Outline) New edition. J. E. Johnsen. |

THE REFERENCE SHELF

Vol. 13

No. 3

REPRESENTATIVE AMERICAN SPEECHES: 1938-1939

SELECTED BY

A. CRAIG BAIRD

Department of Speech, University of Iowa



NEW YORK
THE H. W. WILSON COMPANY
1939

Copyright, 1939
By The H. W. Wilson Company
All Rights Reserved

Published October 1939

Printed in the United States of America

REPRESENTATIVE AMERICAN SPEECHES

Prefatory Note

Representative American Speeches, 1938-39, is Volume II of an annual compilation of American speeches. The addresses in this case are roughly those delivered from June, 1938, to June, 1939.

In the first volume the selections were limited to those composed and delivered by speakers of the United States. Furthermore this compilation represented a variety of speaking types, such as (a) *forensic*, (b) *legislative* or *deliberative*, (c) *pulpit*, (d) *demonstrative* and *ceremonial* (including business, dinner speaking, educational), and (e) *radio*. Moreover the speeches were limited to twenty examples. These principles of selection have guided the editor in his composition of this second volume.

Although some of the most vigorous speaking of the year was done by Hitler, Chamberlain, Anthony Eden, and other European speakers, the list again has included only Americans. (Note that Cordell Hull's address on "The Opening of the Pan-American Conference" was delivered at Lima, Peru, and that President Roosevelt's address "On the Canadian Position of the United States" was delivered at Queen's University, Kingston, Ontario.) Twenty-eight rather than twenty speeches make up this selection of 1938-39. (It should be noted, however, that two of the speeches are by Senator Josh Lee and that three are by President Roosevelt.)

Furthermore the present volume continues to represent a diversity of speaking types or occasions. Forensic addresses include the peroration of a courtroom plea by Thomas Dewey,

and judicial addresses by Charles Evans Hughes and Frank Murphy. Legislative or deliberative speeches are represented by the addresses of Franklin D. Roosevelt, William E. Borah, Cordell Hull, Alben W. Barkley, Joshua Lee, Gerald P. Nye, Jr., Bennett Champ Clark, T. V. Smith, and Henry W. Taft. The pulpit is represented by Harry Emerson Fosdick, Charles W. Gilkey, and Fulton J. Sheen. Demonstrative and ceremonial addresses, including business, dinner speaking, educational and scientific, are exemplified by Nicholas Murray Butler, Joseph E. Eastman, Rexford B. Tugwell, Frank Murphy, Robert Millikan, Robert M. Hutchins and George B. Cutten. Hans V. Kaltenborn illustrates radio speaking situations, although many of the other addresses here reprinted were broadcast. This classification is of course not strictly logical. With modifications to encompass the speaking activities of the present world, this division of speeches is found in Aristotle's *Rhetoric*.

The speeches are usually printed complete. Those delivered in the course of Congressional debate may of course represent only a portion of the whole Congressional discussion. In the case of a running Congressional debate it is at times difficult to decide just what a "complete" speech may be. Kaltenborn's radio broadcast of the European crisis last September represented hours upon hours of commentary with brief interruptions. The example here included is necessarily only an excerpt from the thousands of words as uttered. Thomas E. Dewey's speech on the "Hines Policy-Number Case" includes only the peroration of a final speech for the state, which closing argument occupied an entire day.

The authenticity of a speech text is always open to question. Did the man actually say what the printed page reports him as saying? It is to be admitted that even the speeches of President Roosevelt, illustrated by his address "The New Deal Must Continue," do not coincide always with the official text as furnished by the White House. Impromptu interpolations here and there are not always registered in the official version as furnished by the author. In as far as is possible in the

case of the present volume the speech text was furnished by or approved by the author.

On what basis are we to decide whether a selection represents a good speaker and a good speech? This collection, like the preceding one, is based upon the assumption that a speech is the product of a (1) speaker (one who has audience projection; who through voice and manner controls his audience and impresses them through his speaking leadership; who uses his voice well with clear enunciation, acceptable pronunciation, wide pitch range and pleasing pitch level, well controlled vocal intensity and rate of utterance, pleasing quality of voice with conversational presentation; who has adequate control of bodily mechanism with purposeful gestures and movements; with appealing personality that expresses self-control, sincerity, tact, humor, idealism, and similar traits); presenting (2) a given speech (with significant ideas, subject fully analyzed, excellent in organization and structure, with abundant and persuasive forms of support, with evidence, specific instances, statistics, illustrations, authority, and other details that give logical validity to the document; with efficient and persuasive oral language, that is unhackneyed, clear, concise, and vivid, and with sentence structure flexible, varied, and rhythmical); before (3) an audience (that responds to the speech which is presented in terms of audience belief, drives, interests and attitudes; an audience which responds to the emotional appeal and incentives to action, such as love of country, home, duty), on a (4) specific occasion (such as that of President Nicholas Murray Butler addressing a gathering at the New York World's Fair; Kaltenborn over the radio telling the world that Prague must surrender; President Roosevelt dedicating the Thousand Islands Bridge between the United States and Canada; William E. Borah battling in the United States Senate against Senator Barkley, of Kentucky, and other administration exponents of large Congressional subsidies for naval rearmament; Charles Evans Hughes addressing the two houses of Congress on the occasion of the One Hundred and

Fiftieth anniversary of the first Congress; Thomas E. Dewey before a New York criminal court; Robert M. Hutchins addressing professional men and educators; George Cutten talking to an audience of college undergraduates; Fulton J. Sheen leading a religious program over a national hook-up on a Sunday afternoon)¹

The good speech, then, is a synthesis of these various elements. The good speaker is "good" not simply because of his vocal superiority, but also because of his ideas expressed in appropriate language that impresses and affects the audience. Herbert Hoover, although not an orator as is William E. Borah, does deserve serious consideration in any list of American speakers. The former President does have his flashes of wit and audience insight and in addition has robust content—whether or not we may agree with his political principles. Thus Gilkey, Fosdick, Millikan, Hughes, Taft, Nye and the others in the present compilation find their place because circumstances of the hour gave them opportunity on a specific occasion to produce oral results that may properly be called "representative."

The present editor disavows as he did in the previous volume any claim for these examples as the "best speeches of the year." It is hoped that these addresses are representative "of the kind and quality of speaking done in this country during the period specified." Certainly the opportunities for hearing and reading speeches are today much greater than in former periods. Through reference to the Congressional Records, to the various departments and bureaus at Washington, to scores of religious, educational, business and professional periodicals and pamphlets, to many a weekly and daily paper, and through radio transmission, a student of public speaking may have access to hundreds of examples of speech-making of the hour in the United States.

What of the excellence of these talks of 1938-39 as compared with those of 1937-38? Although the practice of

¹ For an amplification of these tests of a speech see *Representative American Speeches, 1937-38*, p. 3 and 4.

speech-making of two years ago yielded significant examples of the art, the author is convinced that national and international problems and movements of the past year, and the currents of popular thought have combined to give the speeches of the present hour a distinctly better quality than those of the former twelve months. President Roosevelt has continued to give addresses that have been up to his earlier standard. The new crisis in Europe, which persisted throughout the period, the activities of the Seventy-Sixth Congress, in which were debated important issues of national defense and of balancing the national budget—these and similar situations have borne fruit in orations, debates, and radio talks of a high order.

"If at the top of the achievement scale profound oratory is missing, it may be due to the fact that despite our latest business recession, we Americans have had no international, economic, or religious crises cataclysmic enough to give to our prophets tongues of eloquence. Furthermore, our American civilization since 1900, with its materialistic urge, its mass education that has more and more dominated the curriculum even of higher learning, its profound shifts between 1914 and 1929, may explain the vicissitudes and some of the drabness of our platform artistry. Our American speaking is utilitarian rather than artistic. Public speaking in a democracy, like literature and other art forms, mirrors the social movements and the spiritual mores of the times."²

This book is a collection of speeches and in no sense is a document aimed to expound a given political or social attitude. The present compiler disavows sponsorship for the views of the speakers herein included. If most of these speeches seem to be pro-Democratic or pro-Republican, that trend is purely accidental. If the ideas on the whole seem vigorously to defend democracy and the American capitalistic system, that trend in speaking may be due to the fact that American speakers and audiences support that capitalistic philosophy.

² *Op. cit.* p. 6.

This book is arranged for students of speech in secondary schools and colleges, especially debaters, extempore speakers, orators, and interpretative readers; for students of history and contemporary American civilization, and for members of courses in oral and written composition. To facilitate the use of this book for classroom reading, selections are arranged under such representative topics as Peace and War, Foreign Policy, Democracy and Propaganda, Economic and Social Policy, Administration of Justice, Science, Education, and Religion. A speech under one category, it is to be admitted, may also be classed under another. The approach to education through the study of thought-stimulating speeches is amply justified. The present collection has been made partly in the belief that this confused world can be more readily interpreted by those who familiarize themselves with the representative speeches of the hour.

To the authors of the addresses who so generously permitted the reprinting and in a number of cases provided the texts, the author expresses his deep appreciation. The editor is also grateful to his colleagues in speech and to the graduate students in his courses and seminar in the History and Criticism of American Public Speaking, who contributed their critical judgment in the preparation of this book.

A. CRAIG BAIRD

July 25, 1939

The Railroad Problem. Joseph B. Eastman	138
Agriculture, Industry and Labor. Sidney Hillman . . .	142

GOVERNMENT; ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

The 150th Anniversary of the First Congress Charles E. Hughes	161
For a Third Term. Rexford Guy Tugwell	166
Civil Liberties. Frank Murphy	173
The Hines Policy-Numbers Case. Thomas E Dewey . .	181

SCIENCE

Science and the World Tomorrow. Robert A. Millikan	187
--	-----

EDUCATION

Organization and Subject Matter of General Education. Robert M. Hutchins	199
Arise, Let Us Go Hence. George B. Cutten	210

RELIGION

Jesus' Ethical Message Confronts the World. Harry Emerson Fosdick	223
Bridges into a Better World. Charles W. Gilkey . . .	234
Liberty and the Republic. Fulton J. Sheen	245

BIOGRAPHICAL NOTES	253
------------------------------	-----

INDEX	261
-----------------	-----

WAR AND PEACE

WHY WAR?¹

NICHOLAS MURRAY BUTLER

— address was delivered at special exercises in the interest of world peace, as part of the International Business Machines Day, at the New York World's Fair, on May 4th, 1939. The speech was the climax of the ceremonies held in the World's Fair Music Hall, to honor T. J. Watson, President of the International Business Machine Corporation. Mayor LaGuardia, Secretary of State Cordell Hull, and others sent congratulations to Mr. Watson. President W. N. Lewis, of Lafayette College and Commissioner of Education John W. Studebaker, also spoke. The 2500 guests repeatedly applauded President Butler's remarks, and arose to their feet in sustained applause when he asked "Why should we not go back to the famous Joint Resolution passed by the Congress of the United States on June 24, 1910, by unanimous vote in each House, calling upon the President of the United States to lead in the organization of the world for peace with international security protected by the combined navies of the world?"

During the year reviewed in this collection, President Butler continued to give highly impressive addresses on educational and international themes and through the spoken word to exert his leadership as President of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.

Why war? In this year of grace, 1939 of the Christian Era, why is the whole world at war, economic war, emotional war, intellectual war, and shivering under the threat of military war?

How can such a condition be possible? After all that has been said and done through centuries of growing and ripening civilization to raise mankind, wherever he may be, to a higher level of satisfaction and accomplishment and to bring him into relations with his fellow men that will supply new sources of comfort and satisfaction as his years of life pass on, how is this present outlook possible? What has happened?

¹ International Conciliation Pamphlet, No. 351, June, 1939, p 366-9. Reprinted through the courtesy of President Butler.

Bluntly, there has been, and there is, a complete breakdown of moral conviction and moral principles in respect to national and international policies and relations, and an appalling incapacity on the part of the citizens of the world's few free governments that are left to rise to the heights of their responsibility and opportunity.

If you will take the written public record, war is impossible. Every civilized nation has formally and openly renounced it as an instrument of national policy. Why, then, has it not been renounced? Bluntly, again, because governments have not kept their word and have demonstrated that they can no longer be trusted to keep their word.

In consequence, every nation, east and west, north and south, is pouring all its resources, and far more than its available resources, into expenditure for what it calls defense. No government under any circumstance is preparing for offense. Every government is preparing for defense. If that be true, why is preparation for defense necessary? Because no one believes the protestations of governments.

We are living in an age where the ordinary relationships of nations no longer exist. The forms and rules and laws which have been developing for two hundred or three hundred years and which we thought had established themselves in an elaborate and highly useful code of international law and conduct, have all been thrown to the winds, and we are now confronted by pressure politics in the international field of a sort with which we are quite familiar on a much smaller scale in the national field.

This plan of pressure politics aims to achieve revolutionary results without war by threatening war, and the practical question is where will the line be found when that threat of war will find itself tempted to cause and to undertake actual military operations?

One of the outstanding statesmen of Europe said to me in private conversation a few months ago that the appalling thing was that all this trouble in the world is being caused by not to exceed twelve hundred or fifteen hundred men. He

insisted that the peoples everywhere in these democracies, in these totalitarian States, in Asia and South America, wanted peace and prosperity, but that some twelve or fifteen hundred human beings in positions of great responsibility and authority, that authority being largely based on emotional grounds, held the policies of the world today in their hands

What can be done about it? There is only one answer, and that is that these peoples themselves must either compel their existing governments to do as they wish or they must find new instruments of government that will respond to their peaceful ideals and cease these policies of pressure and force and threat which are not only terrifying the whole world, but making impossible any return to prosperity and happiness until these heavy clouds are removed.

Think what must be the feeling of the mothers of the world as they look out on this scene. Many of them remember only too well what happened to their husbands and their sons twenty-five years ago. How many of them can face with equanimity what might, within twenty-four hours, begin to happen to the husbands and sons of today? What is the use of trade, what is the use of industry, what is the use of commerce, what is the use of effort, what is the use of trying to gain some return from all these in order to make mankind more comfortable, more fortunate and better protected in old age and adversity? What is the use of it all? We are pouring out not only the world's earnings, but the world's savings, savings for a thousand years, and those savings are not illimitable. There comes a time when they will have gone, and what will the world do then unless it desists from this policy of threats and this rule of force and terror? What will happen?

In the last war, there was destroyed a value equal to five countries like France, plus five countries like Belgium. Should there be another war tomorrow, that destruction might be five countries like Great Britain, or five countries like the United States of America. And what would history have to say of that one hundred or two hundred years from today, as a com-

ment upon our intelligence, our courage, and our capacity to maintain civilization on the high plane—what?

Believe me, there is need for leadership, a new kind of leadership; not the leadership which meets force with force, not the leadership which regards war as inevitable and spends time and countless monies in preparing for it, but leadership that understands that there is only one way to get rid of war, and that is to remove the causes of war, and that to remove the causes of war means international cooperation and international effort on an economic, a monetary, a social, and a political scale.

Why should not the Government of the United States go back to its traditional leadership in this field which it had in its hand from 1899 until 1919 and which it has let pass out? Why should we not go back with our vast population, our high ideals, our wide political experience, our economic power, our convinced belief in peace and its possibility? Why should we not go back and make the reply on the behalf of the government which President McKinley made to the great rescript of the Czar of all the Russias, one of the greatest documents in human history, when in 1898, he asked the nations of the world to do just what I am proposing they return to do now? Why should we not go back to President McKinley's great statement made with superb eloquence on the day before the assassin took his life? "The period of exclusiveness is past." Why should we not go back to Secretary Elihu Root's instructions to the American delegation to the second Hague Conference in 1908 which resulted in arranging for a Permanent Court of International Justice? Why should we not go back to the famous Joint Resolution passed by the Congress of the United States on June 24, 1910, by unanimous vote in each House, calling upon the President of the United States to lead in the organization of the nations of the world for peace with international security protected by the combined navies of the world?

Twenty-nine years ago the Congress of the United States passed that resolution without a dissenting vote in either

House. Then came the Great War, the sad results of which I need not repeat. But here we are today faced with this perfectly appalling calamity, and voices saying that it is no concern of ours, that we need not care if one neighbor murders his neighbor, or if one human being assaults another human being, so long as they do not live in our house or belong to our family. That sort of neutrality is gross immorality.

The sooner and the more completely that it is pronounced as such and denounced as such, the farther shall we be along on the road to peace. That sort of conduct leads inevitably to war, no matter what professions may accompany it. If the United States Government, from its present commanding position, can, for the moment, keep itself outside of and above the particular causes of conflict—except economic, in which we are involved already—that are likely to lead to military war, why should not that Government today say to the whole world, "We remember what we said in 1898 to the Czar of all the Russias. We remember what we said in 1908 which led to the Permanent Court of International Justice. We remember what our Congress voted in 1910 to promote the peace of the world, and today we say to you, there is where we stand and that is what we propose to do."

CZECHOSLOVAKIA CAPITULATES¹

H. V. KALTENBORN

This talk was broadcast at 10 00 and at 11.00 P M E S T on Thursday, September 29, 1938, over the Columbia Broadcasting System.

When the September crisis of Europe developed, the American broadcasting systems mobilized their facilities to give to the people complete information of the events leading to the settlement of Munich. In "studio nine" of the Columbia System's New York station, Kaltenborn and his colleagues "kept right by the microphone night and day from Hitler's Nuremberg speech on September 12th until the day after the signing of the Four Power agreement in Munich on the 29th." During the period of eighteen days, Kaltenborn made eighty-five broadcasts—"easily a record for continuous broadcasting by an individual. Each talk was entirely unprepared, being an analysis of the news as it was occurring." With an army cot beside him for such rest as might be snatched, Kaltenborn digested the cable dispatches that came through the ticker, and with earphones clamped on, he followed the radio comments from Prague, London, Berlin, Paris, with his own commentaries.

The small unit of broadcasting printed below reflects this commentator's interpretation of the Four Power agreement.

Early on Friday morning, September 30, the statesmen of Great Britain, France, Germany and Italy, at Munich, agreed to allow the Reich troops to occupy German portions of Czechoslovakia's Sudetenland. Public opinion in the allied countries, although rejoicing at the continuation of peace, regarded the agreement as marking the practical dismemberment of Czechoslovakia and a recognition of the ascendancy of Germany in Central Europe. Kaltenborn's prophecy, uttered a few minutes after the news of the agreement came to him, was significantly correct. "Yes, Prague will accept because it must." Kaltenborn was unquestionably the American radio commentator of the year.

The terms which you have just heard represent a complete victory for Adolf Hitler

One of the points that are important to note, first, is the complete exclusion of Russia, which marks the beginning of Russia's exclusion from the councils of Europe, because if this

¹ *I Broadcast the Crisis* Random House, New York, 1938. p. 244-6
By permission of the author. Reprinted by courtesy of Random House, New York, and of Mr. Kaltenborn.

Four-Power Conference precedes others to be carried on along the same lines, it definitely means that there is now a cooperation of Fascists and Democratic Powers of France and England, for the exclusion of Russia from the councils of Europe.

Hungary and Poland will also receive concessions of territory. That is inherent in the implications of the agreement. The Czechoslovak Government will undoubtedly negotiate such cessions with Poland and with Hungary within the brief period of time that is allowed in the official agreement. Then Germany and Italy may join in the agreement to respect Czechoslovakia's remaining frontiers. It is to be noted that for the moment only France and England join in that guarantee.

The French delegation was completely broken as it left the council room and prepared to return to France. The reason is obvious. When this proposal is presented to the French Chamber of Deputies many voices will be raised to oppose it and criticize it. That same thing will be true in lesser measure in the British Parliament. But Prime Minister Chamberlain has a tremendous majority in the House of Commons and the relief at not being obliged to fight a war will offset the humiliation which the British will feel in this surrender to Hitler's demands.

Many questions of details are still to arise. The International Commission will presumably look after those. The Commission has a good deal of authority, and it is possible that when it makes those ethnological adjustments which were referred to in the text, it will perhaps give Czechoslovakia certain concessions which do not appear on the surface of the agreement.

Fundamentally, however, this does represent an almost complete victory for Hitler. Like most negotiators, he asked for much more than he expected to get, and I venture to say that he got much more than he really expected.

Military leaders, not the civilian leaders, have won. It is, of course, a victory for the dictators.

They're right in Italy and Germany to rejoice. General Goering gave a party in celebration.

Fascists have taken it as a big victory for Premier Mussolini. And why not? Great leaders, great Powers came to Benito Mussolini and said to him, "You are the man; only you can have some power of persuasion over Adolf Hitler. Won't you please intercede with him and ask him to preserve the world's peace?"

And Benito Mussolini graciously accepted the obligation of saying a word to the other end of the Rome-Berlin axis

Edward Murrow tells us that in London there is rejoicing over peace; there is for the moment relief, but as he suggests, criticism may come later. I remember one phrase of comment he used in his earlier talk this evening "Must concessions be made each time a nation threatens violence?"—for that is a question that is being asked by many millions the world over tonight.

Naturally there is a wave of gratitude that peace has been preserved but one wonders whether it is peace, or whether it just may not be the prelude to other demands and other concessions and then finally to the type of demand which no concessions can satisfy and which will end in the break that has now, happily enough, been avoided.

There is one great Power in Europe, mighty in its military force, mighty because it extends from the Baltic to the Pacific, that has been completely excluded from any contact with this conference, and yet it is a Power whose might cannot be wished out of the world, it is a Power that will become more cynical because of what has happened at Munich—Soviet Russia. Moscow tonight calls the Munich Agreement "A routine endeavor to molly-coddle an aggressor" That's typical of Soviet sarcasm, but one wonders whether to some extent it may not be justified.

As I studied out on the map the details of some of the terms, I saw how clever Hitler was in the way he has arranged his military occupation. Where do troops go in first? Not from Germany; not into that little finger of Czech terri-

tory that sticks out into Germany, where the Germans are already established over half the distance. Oh no, they'll march in on Saturday from Austria to signify that it was Austria first and Czechoslovakia second. Who knows what may be third?

And of course you're asking: "But will Prague accept this?" Doubt has been expressed on various points tonight. I can't share that doubt. I have in mind the Czech memorandum, so sincere, so pleading, so gracious. The Prague Government submitted this one in a last, final endeavor to secure some concessions for itself. There is one paragraph stating that at this critical juncture the Czechoslovak Government is placing the interests of civilization and world peace before the distress of its own people and is resolved to make sacrifices which never in history were asked from an undefeated state with such concentrated effort.

Yes, Prague will accept because it must.

AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY

THE CANADIAN POSITION OF THE UNITED STATES¹

FRANKLIN DELANO ROOSEVELT

This address was delivered at Queen's University, Kingston, Ontario, Canada, on August 18, 1938. President Roosevelt had gone there to receive the honorary degree of LL D. before dedicating a new international bridge across the St. Lawrence River. The stadium audience, electrified, so far forgot themselves on this academic occasion as to break into wild applause and cheering at the close of the address. The statement, "I give you the assurance that the people of the United States will not stand idly by if domination of Canadian soil is threatened by any other empire," was widely hailed as a "turning point in United States foreign policy" and as an "extension of the Monroe Doctrine." President Roosevelt later denied that his speech was so designed. Britain and France loudly applauded. The address was interpreted as a direct arraignment of Germany, Italy, and Japan.

President Roosevelt later in the day dedicated the Thousand Islands Bridge, the chief purpose of his Canadian visit. The two addresses should be examined together

MISTER CHANCELLOR, MISTER PRIME MINISTER, MY NEW FOUND ASSOCIATES OF QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY: To the pleasure of being once more on Canadian soil where I have passed so many of the happy hours of my life, there is added today a very warm sense of gratitude for being admitted to the fellowship of this ancient and famous university. I am glad to join the brotherhood which Queen's has contributed and is contributing not only to the spiritual leadership for which the college was established, but also to the social and public leadership in the civilized life of Canada.

An American President is precluded by our Constitution from accepting any title from a foreign Prince, potentate, or power. Queen's University is not a Prince or a potentate but it is a power. Yet I can say, without constitutional reserve,

¹ By permission of President Roosevelt. Text supplied through the courtesy of Mr. Stephen Early, Secretary to the President.

that the acceptance of the title which you confer on me today would raise no qualms in the august breast of our own Supreme Court.

Civilization is not national—it is international—even though that observation—trite to most of us, is today challenged in some parts of the world. Ideas are not limited by territorial borders, they are the common inheritance of all free people. Thought is not anchored in any land, and the profit of education redounds to the equal benefit of the whole world. That is one form of free trade to which the leaders of every opposing political party can subscribe.

In a large sense we in the Americas stand charged today with the maintaining of that tradition. When, speaking recently in a similar vein in the Republic of Brazil, I included the Dominion of Canada in the fellowship of the Americas, our South American neighbors gave hearty acclaim. We in the Americas know the sorrow and the wreckage which may follow if the ability of men to understand each other is rooted out from among the nations.

Many of us here today know from experience that of all the devastations of war none is more tragic than the destruction which it brings to the processes of men's minds. Truth is denied because emotion pushes it aside. Forebearance is succeeded by bitterness. In that atmosphere human thought cannot advance.

It is impossible not to remember that for years when Canadians and Americans have met they have light-heartedly saluted as North American friends, without thought of dangers from overseas. Yet we are awake to the knowledge that the casual assumption of our greetings in earlier times today must become a matter for serious thought.

A few days ago a whisper, fortunately untrue, raced round the world that armies standing over against each other in unhappy array were to be set in motion. In a few short hours the effect of that whisper had been registered in Montreal and New York, in Ottawa and in Washington, in Toronto and in Chicago, in Vancouver and in San Francisco. Your business

men and ours felt it alike; your farmers and ours heard it alike; your young men and ours wondered what effect this might have on their lives.

We in the Americas are no longer a far away continent, to which the eddies of controversies beyond the seas could bring no interest or no harm. Instead, we in the Americas have become a consideration to every propaganda office and to every general staff beyond the seas. The vast amount of our resources, the vigor of our commerce and the strength of our men have made us vital factors in world peace whether we choose or not.

Happily, you and we, in friendship and in entire understanding, can look clear-eyed at these possibilities, resolving to leave no pathway unexplored and no technique undeveloped which may, if our hopes are realized, contribute to the peace of the world. Even if those hopes are disappointed, we can assure each other that this hemisphere at least shall remain a strong citadel wherein civilization can flourish unimpaired.

The Dominion of Canada is part of the sisterhood of the British Empire. I give to you assurance that the people of the United States will not stand idly by if domination of Canadian soil is threatened by any other Empire.

We as good neighbors are true friends because we maintain our own rights with frankness, because we refuse to accept the twists of secret diplomacy, because we settle our disputes by consultation and because we discuss our common problems in the spirit of the common good. We seek to be scrupulously fair and helpful not only in our relations with each other but each of us at home in our relations with our own people.

But there is one process which we certainly cannot change and probably ought not to change. This is the feeling which ordinary men and women have about events which they can understand. We cannot prevent our people from having an opinion in regard to wanton brutality, in regard to undemocratic regimentation, in regard to misery inflicted on helpless peoples, or in regard to violations of accepted individual

rights. All that any government, constituted as is yours and mine, can possibly undertake is to help make sure that the facts are known and fairly stated. No country where thought is free can prevent every fireside and home within its borders from considering the evidence for itself and rendering its own verdict; and the sum total of these conclusions of educated men and women will, in the long run, become the national verdict.

That is what we mean when we say that public opinion ultimately governs policy. It is right and just that this should be the case.

Many of our ancestors came to Canada and the United States because they wished to break away from systems which forbade them to think freely and their descendants have insisted on the right to know the truth—to argue their problems to a majority decision, and, if they remained unconvinced, to disagree in peace. As a tribute to our likeness in that respect, I note that the Bill of Rights in your country and in mine is substantially the same.

Mr. Chancellor, you of Canada who respect the educational tradition of our democratic continent will ever maintain good neighborship in ideas as we in the public service hope and propose to maintain it in the field of government and of foreign relations. My good friend, the Governor General, in receiving an honorary degree in June at that university of Cambridge, Massachusetts, to which Mackenzie King and I both belong, suggested that we cultivate three qualities to keep our foothold in the shifting sands of the present—humility, humanity and humor. All three of them, imbedded in education, build new spans to reestablish free intercourse throughout the world and bring forth an order in which free nations can live in peace.

POSSIBLE RESULTS OF A EUROPEAN WAR ¹

WILLIAM E. BORAH

Senator Borah delivered this speech over the radio on March 25th, 1939. Senator Burton K. Wheeler said of it, "I wish to say that in my judgment it is a great American speech and one which should be widely read." It presents in compact form the Borah vigorous arguments given during March in the Senate debates on the problems of increases for the army and navy and of changes in the neutrality legislation. The Senator here summons evidence, illuminates his text with flashes of oratory, of humor, and he expounds his political philosophy. In his seventy-fourth year he continues to rank with the country's ablest political speakers, both in the Senate and over the air. In a secret ballot, the officials of the Washington broadcasting stations in 1934, picked the five best political speakers of the nation. These choices were in order: "President Roosevelt, Hugh Johnson, Senator Borah, Secretary Wallace, and Secretary Perkins." (*New York Times*, August 2, 1934, p. 19.)

On March 1st Borah in the Senate denied that the United States has an isolationist policy, and he opposed the proposed appropriations for a submarine base at Guam. He favored a war referendum (March 18); assaulted the Pittman bill proposing a cash-and-carry-policy toward belligerents in a war (March 19). An informal vote of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee a few days later revealed that the twenty-three members were divided into several groups in their opinions as to what should be done concerning the Neutrality Act. There were collectivists, isolationists, supporters of the present law, undecided members, and those who refused to commit themselves. On the eve of the Committee hearings, on possible changes in the law, these hearings to begin on March 26th, Senator Borah appealed to the country over the NBC network.

In July 1939, the Senate Committee by a vote of twelve to eleven voted (contrary to Roosevelt's urgent request) to recommend no bill modifying the present neutrality legislation.

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: What would happen in this country if we should permit ourselves to be drawn into a European war? It is a legitimate question to propound and

¹ Congressional record. 84: no 61:4725-7. March 27, 1939. By permission and through the courtesy of Senator Borah.

about which we ought all to be thinking, for powerful influences at home and abroad are seeking by all kinds of methods to bring us to that end, to involve us in all the racial, territorial, and financial problems of Europe, and ultimately, in war. What will happen to the American people, their homes, their children, and their liberty? What will happen to this Republic? For war, of all things on earth, is freedom's greatest enemy. We are told that we may have to go to war. Nevertheless, it is proper to ask: What will happen if we do? If we reflect sufficiently upon these matters, it will at least help us to weigh carefully—and may I say, prayerfully—the steps by which we may be led into these European controversies and into European wars.

First, what are the conditions in these days of peace, the conditions which will confront us, if war comes, for upon these conditions we will have to build for war. We now have a national debt, including obligations underwritten, of forty-five billion dollars, a budget of something over ten billion, a deficit somewhere around three and one-half billion. We have a tax burden so heavy that it is breaking the spirit and paralyzing the energy of millions of our people. Do these things have anything to do with preparedness for war? Do they have any bearing upon the stability of perpetuity of this Government? We also have eleven million unemployed and we have the squalor and the misery, the sorrow and the discouragement which come with such unemployment. We have one-third of our industrious, law-abiding citizens, it is estimated, men and women anxious to win back prosperity and a decent way of living, to rear in respect and happiness their children, living on the bare necessities of life or upon charity. Do these things have anything to do with the question of whether we should enter a war? Do not these conditions show we are wholly unprepared for war, regardless of the extent of our armaments? Do they not show that we are indeed a sick nation and that in this condition of affairs is to be found the real danger to our democracy? Are not these things which make for confusion and demoralization, socially and

politically, the very things which are sapping the foundation of this Republic? Do they not create the soil from which spring the isms and systems which constitute the real menace to democracy?

But, had I the time and you the patience, I would take you to the legislative Isle of Patmos, that is, to the congressional files where rest the bills introduced and to be considered and probably passed in case of war. You will find there such revelations, and you need not possess the vision of the Apostle of Old, as I venture to say you have never dreamed of. You will get an intimation of what will happen when war comes to this country. These measures would not leave untouched or uncontrolled any duty or any right of the citizen except that of paying taxes and going to war. These bills are offered in good faith by able men, by men who confidently believe that in case of war they would be an essential part of the war program. They ask for your money, if you have any. There would be no free speech, no free press, no liberty, except such liberty as would be essential to serve the cause of war.

It is urged, especially by our friends abroad, that we as a nation and as a people have great responsibility. We certainly have! Our first and supreme responsibility is to put our own house in order, to demonstrate that this free enterprise, this democracy of ours, is a success. At a time when doubt and challenge rest like mildew upon the faith of men and women in free government and free institutions, our first responsibility is to drive want and hunger from our midst, to give men and women an opportunity to work. Ours is an imperative responsibility to prove to the world that there is such a thing as free government with a free people—a happy, prosperous, contented, and loyal people. This would give inspiration to people everywhere who covet freedom, and above all, it would be the very best security we could have for our own peace and liberty. But, if in addition to our own tremendous task, we undertake to place all other peoples in their proper places, to designate what kind of a government

they should have, to guarantee boundary lines, to cleanse and purify the inhuman creeds of other lands, I venture to say this Republic would break down in the effort and our people would be compelled to take up a load they could not possibly carry.

Twenty-two years ago we laid the conscriptive power of this Government upon the youth of our land and took them across the sea to fight and die in an effort to adjust other peoples' problems. I have no intention of reflecting upon either the wisdom or the patriotism of that sublime adventure. But has it no lesson to teach? Do we not now realize how toughly engrained and how inherently imbedded in the whole structure and civilization of Europe are the ambitions of rulers, racial antipathy, intolerance, and, most of all, the belief that only by force can such matters be dealt with. We entertained the hope then that in the presence of the power of this Republic, these things would give way, governments would become more liberal, and liberty more secure, and, above all, the people would have a happier outlook. We returned home, leaving our dead in foreign soil, bringing with us the maimed and the insane, leaving behind a Europe poisoned and torn with bitterness and hate, the breeding ground of many wars, and saturated with more imperialistic schemes and personal ambitions than have been known since the days of the Caesars. All these things were embodied in so-called peace treaties to be preserved, fostered and nurtured until the time should ripen them for action. Not since the Hundred Years' War was Europe so embittered and impoverished as it was the day the Versailles Treaty was signed and the great Frenchman, Clemenceau, truly said, in substance: "This is a continuation of the war."

About the only treasure we brought home was the story of endurance and undaunted heroism of the untrained American boy, taken from the factory or the farm and thrown almost overnight into the hell of European battlefields—a story without precedent in all the annals of war.

It is important that we discuss among ourselves and fully realize what the issue is in Europe. What is it that is threatening the world with another war? I must say that, in my opinion, it is imperialism—that is, territory, colonies, raw material, trade. These are things which are dominating the movements of the different governments regardless of what may be said by individuals of these governments as to the issues. Let the imperialistic questions be adjusted satisfactorily to democracies and the creed of intolerance, war upon liberty, are passed over, condoned. In no official coming together of the totalitarian states and the democracies, in the discussion of differences, has the question of nazism, with all its teachings, ever been brought forward, much less made an issue.

No better friend since Hitler became the master of Germany has Hitler had than the British democracy. Apparently regarding arbitrary, centralized government in Europe as the best guarantee of stability, it has built up Hitler's strength and favored his cause in every crucial situation. There is material in Europe for a crusade in behalf of morals and liberty with which a Gladstone could fire a continent, but democracies with more than half of their subjects denied such guarantees and privileges as may be found in our Bill of Rights will not make use of this material. I will say in fairness they cannot under the circumstances make use of this material or make it the issue. I will give some facts in support of my contention.

When Japan seized Manchuria and our government asked that Great Britain join in a protest, the British government sent one of her ablest men to Geneva and, in the face of two treaties, defended the lawless act of Japan. It was argued that British interests would be better protected by Japan. This seizure of Manchuria and its success laid the foundation for the present war against China.

When Hitler was preparing for the taking over of Austria, a representative of the British Government let Berlin know that it might be well for Europe if Austria passed into stronger

hands. As the time drew near for the use of the political guillotine on this weak nation, Ribbentrop, Hitler's special and spent several days with the members of the British Government and representative, visited London, arriving March 9th, 1938. He dined with the King, with Mr. Chamberlain, Lord Halifax. On March 11th, after the preemptory ultimatums of Hitler began to pour in upon Austria, Schuschnigg, Austria's Prime Minister, in his desperation, began a hunt for friends among the democracies. He used the phone. He called up Paris, but no member of the government could be found. He tried London, but he could not contact with any member of the government. It was at this time, this very time, when it was fully known what was transpiring, that the representative of Hitler was visiting with the King, with Mr. Chamberlain, Lord Halifax, and others. It is reported that the Archbishop of Canterbury was among them. There was no voice to be found here against the seizure of Austria or in behalf of democracy.

During the dismemberment of Czechoslovakia, no mention was ever made of the teachings and practices of nazi-ism or of the danger of enlarging its influence in Europe. Although they were turning over a vast number of people, some of whom it was too well known, bore the mortal enmity of their new master, no suggestion was ever made in the settlement of territorial matters in behalf of or as to proper treatment and reasonable protection of these people. Can anyone find anything unfriendly in these proceedings, or any antipathy, to nazi-ism, as such, during the period in which the only real Republic in Europe was on the operating table. After the deed had been done and the two republics had sent the ultimatum of September 19th near midnight, to Czechoslovakia calling for a decision within a few hours, Mr. Chamberlain made his settlement with Hitler and exhibited it to the world saying, in effect, that you can trust this man. "I take up my place alongside of him. I ask for no modification of his philosophy of government." In doing so, he gave greater power and greater prestige to Hitler throughout Europe than

he perhaps himself ever hoped to enjoy. Nothing was said, nothing was suggested that the individual with whom he had taken up his position was to change his creed or to modify in any respect his views which had startled the world and which in the near future was to enact a scene which in its cruelty and hideousness beggars description.

My time is limited, and I shall not follow up the facts demonstrating beyond all question that what the democracies are contending for is the realization of their imperialistic schemes and not the destruction of nazi-ism. I will call the roll of the States who can testify to this fact, the roll, as given to the world by one of England's distinguished statesmen: China, Ethiopia, Austria, Czechoslovakia, and the Republic of Spain.

For myself, I would adhere closely to the advice of Washington—no entangling alliances, express or implied. I would regard the Monroe Doctrine as a part of our national defense and a cornerstone of our foreign policy. I would send no money to European war chests, no munitions to any nation engaged in war, and above all, no American boy to be sacrificed to the machinations of European imperialism.

THE UNITED STATES' POLICY TOWARD WAR ¹

FRANKLIN DELANO ROOSEVELT

This address was broadcast from the White House as part of the opening program of the New York Herald-Tribune Eighth Forum on Current Problems, on Wednesday night, October 26, 1938. Before the same audience, Herbert Hoover had ably argued that there is little likelihood of territorial encroachment on the western hemisphere; "that there is no immediate prospect of war in Europe, for" war is more remote "since the Munich settlement." Thus the President and his Republican opponent in this Forum held a debate, in substance, on the issue of the prospects of war. Their points of view were directly opposed on foreign policy and national defense. Roosevelt's speech was significant as foreshadowing the principles to be incorporated in his special messages to the incoming Congress, on foreign policy and national defense, and as throwing light on his own efforts in October to prevent war in Europe.

No one who lived through the grave hours of last month can doubt the longing of most of the peoples of the world for an enduring peace. Our business now is to utilize the desire for peace, to build principles which are the only basis of permanent peace.

It is becoming increasingly clear that peace by fear has no higher or more enduring quality than peace by the sword.

There can be no peace if the reign of law is to be replaced by a recurrent sanctification of sheer force.

There can be no peace if national policy adopts as a deliberate instrument the threat of war.

There can be no peace if national policy adopts as a deliberate instrument the dispersion all over the world of millions of helpless and persecuted wanderers with no place to lay their heads.

¹ By permission of President Roosevelt. Reprinted from the text furnished through the courtesy of Mr. Stephen Early, Secretary to the President.

There can be no peace if humble men and women are not free to think their own thoughts, to express their own feelings, to worship God.

There can be no peace if economic resources that ought to be devoted to social and economic reconstruction are to be diverted to an intensified competition in armaments which will merely heighten the suspicions and fears and threaten the economic prosperity of each and every nation.

At no time in modern history has the responsibility which rests upon governments been more obvious or more profound

I speak for a United States which has no interest in war. We covet nothing save good relations with our neighbors; and we recognize that the world today has become our neighbor.

But in the principle of the good neighbor certain fundamental reciprocal obligations are involved. There must be a deliberate and conscious will that such political changes as changing needs require shall be made peacefully.

That means a due regard for the sanctity of treaties. It means deliberate avoidance of policies which arouse fear and distress. It means the self-restraint to refuse strident ambitions which are sure to breed insecurity and intolerance and thereby weaken the prospect of that economic and moral recovery the world so sadly needs.

You cannot organize civilization around the core of militarism and at the same time expect reason to control human destinies.

For more than twelve years, the United States has been steadily seeking disarmament.

Yet we have consistently pointed out that neither we, nor any nation, will accept disarmament while neighbor nations arm to the teeth. If there is not general disarmament, we ourselves must continue to arm. It is a step we do not like to take, and do not wish to take. But, until there is general abandonment of weapons capable of aggression, ordinary rules of national prudence and common sense require that we be prepared.

We still insist that an armament race among nations is absurd unless new territories or new controls are coveted. We are entitled, I think, to greater reassurance than can be given by words: the kind of proof which can be given, for example, by actual discussions, leading to actual disarmament. Not otherwise can we be relieved of the necessity of increasing our own military and naval establishments. For while we refuse to accept as a permanent necessity the idea of force, and reject it as an ideal of life, we must be prepared to meet with success any application of force against us.

We in the United States do not seek to impose on any other people either our way of life or our internal form of government. But we are determined to maintain and protect that way of life and that form of government for ourselves. And we are determined to use every endeavor in order that the Western Hemisphere may work out its own interrelated salvation in the light of its own interrelated experience.

And we affirm our faith that, whatever choice of way of life a people makes, that choice must not threaten the world with the disaster of war. The impact of such a disaster cannot be confined. It releases a flood-tide of evil emotions fatal to civilized living. That statement applies not to the Western Hemisphere alone but to the whole of Europe and Asia and Africa and the islands of the seas.

In all that I have said to you I have reaffirmed the faith of the American people in democracy. The way of democracy is free discussion—as exemplified by the objectives of the Forum to which I am speaking. Free discussion is most greatly useful when it is restrained and relates to facts. It is not useful to suggest either to the American people or to the peoples of other nations that the American Government, its policies, its practices and its servants are actuated by motives of dishonor or corruption. To do so is, of necessity, an attack on the American system of constitutional representative government itself.

Let us work with greater unity for peace among the nations of the world, for restraint, for negotiation and for community

of effort. Let us work for the same ideals within our own borders in our relations with each other, so that we may, if the test ever comes, have that unit of will with which alone a democracy can successfully meet its enemies

THE OPENING OF THE PAN AMERICAN CONFERENCE ¹

CORDELL HULL

Secretary of State, Cordell Hull, delivered this speech at Lima, Peru, on December 10, 1938, at the opening of the Pan American Conference. Each of the twenty-one nations had sent delegates. The main issue of the gathering involved the solidarity of the American states in defense against the possible encroachments of totalitarianism. Secretary Hull's speech was a "personal triumph." Strong applause greeted him before he spoke and especially at that point in his remarks when he declared that "America would not permit invasion." The speech was broadcast and at intervals translated into Spanish. In view of the independent positions assumed by Brazil and the representatives of one or two other countries, and in view of the delicate problems growing out of our commercial competition with European nations in South America, and our interest in supporting the Monroe Doctrine, the conciliatory tone and diplomatic emphasis of the speech were noteworthy.

The speaker was widely acclaimed in the press of Latin America and the United States for his views as here set forth. Secretary Hull also gave radio addresses from Lima on December 9th and December 13th.

His own appraisal of the Conference results was highly optimistic. The Pan American Conference, he stated at the end of December, "made it clear that the American nations are united in their effort to secure on this continent and throughout the world a system of international relations that will mean peace, economic security, and friendly understanding and cooperation among the people of the American nations." A Gallup poll, of the American Institute of Public Opinion, released on December 6th, indicated that the American public approved Mr. Hull's Latin American policy and program.

MR. PRESIDENT, MEMBERS OF THE CONFERENCE, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: It is a matter of unusual satisfaction to me and my associates to meet and greet the members of the other American delegations, with many of whom I have had the good fortune of being associated at previous inter-American conferences.

¹ By the courtesy of the author. Text supplied by the Department of State.

This being one of our regular inter-American conferences, it is well to survey briefly the course of events since we last assembled in this capacity. These events are today of profound significance to our nations and to the whole world.

I

Five years have elapsed since the Seventh International Conference of the American States met at Montevideo. That conference faced a somber prospect of continuing deterioration in the field of international relations in several parts of the world.

The years of profound and world-wide economic dislocation had taken a heavy toll of material losses and human suffering everywhere. International commercial, financial, and monetary relations were in a state of disorder and confusion. Unprecedented trade barriers of every description had arisen and continued to rise in all countries. Exchange of goods among nations had fallen precipitately, both in value and in physical volume. These developments were serving to intensify economic depression in all countries, to disrupt and reduce prices, especially of primary products, to destroy values, to discourage enterprise, to create widespread unemployment and general distress, and to undermine the foundations of social and political stability.

Side by side with these mounting difficulties—and, in large measure, as their result—there appeared ominous signs of a disastrous lowering of standards in international political relations. Respect for the pledged word and willingness to fulfill treaty obligations were rapidly weakening. An effort to reach agreement on a broad program of limitation and progressive reduction of armaments was swiftly moving to the point of tragic failure.

On our continent, too, the relationships among the American nations were not altogether happy. Misunderstanding, prejudice, and aloofness characterized many phases of relations between some of the American nations.

The Seventh International Conference of American States performed a task of historic importance. The representatives of the sister republics brought to the work of the Conference a deep sense of responsibility, a firm determination to find a better way of international life than that toward which mankind seemed to be drifting. The Conference laid a solid foundation for future accomplishments on the broadest scale and outlined definite and concrete programs to promote peace, progress, and prosperity in the Western Hemisphere.

The 21 American republics represented at Montevideo affirmed their devotion to peace and their condemnation of resort to armed force as an instrument of accomplishing national aims. They proclaimed their belief in fair play, fair dealing, and mutual respect for the independence, the sovereignty, and the rights of nations as the indispensable bases of a civilized world order under law. They took important steps toward making effective a concrete machinery for the maintenance of peace on the American Continent.

The Montevideo Conference laid greater emphasis than had ever been done before in inter-American relations on the imperative need of expanding economic relationships, among the American nations and among all nations, upon a sound and healthy basis of fair dealing and equal treatment. In the discussions and formal pronouncement of the Conference, there was fuller recognition than ever before of the indispensability of such economic relationships for the prosperity and social stability within nations, as well as for peaceful and orderly relations between nations. In its resolutions, the Conference urged vigorously a comprehensive program of rehabilitation and improvement of international economic and financial relations.

During the years that followed the Montevideo Conference, the influence of the work accomplished there bore fruit in the form of steadily and rapidly improving relations among the American nations. But, at the same time, elsewhere in the world international relationships continued to deteriorate. Solemn treaty obligations were being increasingly brushed

aside or breached. A gigantic program of rearmament was being rendered inevitable for the entire world by the announced determination on the part of a number of large countries to use armed force as an instrument of attaining their national aims and by their intensive activity in armament construction.

New world problems, affecting the vital interests of all American nations, were arising with startling rapidity. Accordingly, the representatives of our 21 republics met, two years ago at Buenos Aires, in an Inter-American Conference for the Maintenance of Peace.

Building on the foundations laid down at Montevideo, the Buenos Aires Conference carried far forward the work of strengthening and perfecting the structure of peace in the Western Hemisphere. By the signing at that Conference of several far-reaching conventions, treaties, and protocols and by the adoption of a Declaration of Principles of Inter-American Solidarity and Cooperation, powerful instruments of peace were forged at Buenos Aires. A system was thus created under which the American nations undertook to maintain peace among themselves and pledged themselves to consult with each other in the event that the peace of any one of them might be threatened—whether on the American Continent or from outside.

The creation of this American system was the outstanding accomplishment of the Buenos Aires Conference. In addition, our nations reaffirmed their determination, already clearly and vigorously expressed at Montevideo, to work in the direction of improved economic relations and of closer cultural relationships as necessary foundations of order under law. Under this system and as a result of this determination, peace and friendly cooperation prevail today in the Western Hemisphere.

The Treaty of Peace between the Republics of Bolivia and Paraguay, concluded last July, is one of the most significant and encouraging developments in inter-American relations during recent years. By this peace the two countries gave an undeniable example to the faithless and the reckless

who think that questions can be settled only by force or frightfulness.

Finally may I add that it should be a matter of profound gratification to all of us that our nations can point to an impressive record of accomplishment during the past 5 years. To be sure, stock taking alone, even as satisfying as this, is not sufficient. We are faced today with world problems and world conditions which are even more difficult and fraught with more danger for all of us than those with which we were confronted at Montevideo and at Buenos Aires. Our present Conference has before it tasks of utmost gravity and responsibility. But a clear visualization of what we have already accomplished and a realization, therefore, of what we are capable of accomplishing should aid us enormously in applying ourselves to the tasks which are before us.

II

There is no mystery about the reasons why developments in the Western Hemisphere during recent years have been so markedly different from those which have occurred in many other parts of the world. In large measure, the explanation lies in the fact that the American nations have in common certain important and fundamental characteristics.

Each of our nations arose out of a revolution which had for its objective national independence and the assertion of human rights and of popular government. The men and women of the particular generation in each of our countries which achieved for its people independent nationhood staked their all on a passionate conviction that forms of government can be created under which human rights will be secure. They gladly fought for the vindication of their conviction. They bequeathed to us of today not only the forms of such government but also the spirit on the basis of which alone institutions of this character can endure.

Throughout its national existence, each of our nations has sought to perfect within its frontiers a system of repre-

sentative government and of liberty for the individual. In this supreme endeavor, some of us have encountered greater internal difficulties than have others. Some of us have remained free from interference of outside forces, some have had to combat such forces. But in each and every one of our nations there has been no flagging in the determination of the people to preserve national independence and freedom for the individual.

Our nations have drawn into their populations men of many races, creeds, and languages. This fact has not operated as an element of weakness. The occasion for the adjustment of race to race and of creed to creed has been in large measure instrumental in teaching us how to develop adjustment of individual to individual and of group to group without which civilized society and democratic forms of social and political organization cannot function satisfactorily.

A spirit of tolerance, mutual respect, and understanding is as important in the relations of our nations with each other as in our internal relations. Happily this spirit has been present, although it has not always developed uninterruptedly along an upward trend. Like all things human, it has had its fluctuations. Disagreements and controversies have arisen among us. But they have remarkably seldom been settled by the arbitrament of violent conflict, in the form of either military or other types of coercion.

International relations in the Western Hemisphere have not been free from the paralyzing and disruptive forces of narrow nationalism. But the operation of these forces has been paralleled—and, happily, increasingly overcome—by the growth of solidarity, of common concern for peace and progress in our relations with each other, by a strengthening of determination to adjust by pacific means alone whatever differences may arise among us.

It is not an accident that American nations have been peculiarly interested in the development of international law. Relationships such as those which have been steadily growing up among us are impossible unless rules of international con-

duct are carefully defined and unless such rules are fully accepted and become governing. That is the essence of civilized order in the international life of the world.

Historically speaking, the developments which I have briefly described have not been peculiar to the Western Hemisphere. For a century and a half, the progress of human enlightenment and human freedom continued throughout the world, overturning the bulwarks of tyranny and opening the way for the establishment of democratic institutions and the assertion of human rights. Nor has the earnest search for world order under law been confined to any one portion of the globe. The developments which have taken place in the Western Hemisphere have been a part of a mighty stream of new ideas, new concepts, new attitudes of mind and spirit, which has coursed and ramified, with differing degrees of vigor and success, throughout the world. We have made important contributions to that stream, and have, in turn, been nourished by it.

III

Unfortunately, in recent years, powerful forces in some parts of the world have challenged the validity of the primary and basic principles upon the foundation of which we and the rest of mankind have been building the edifice of our social organization and of our international life. Whatever outer garments they may wear today, these forces are not new in the experience of mankind. Fundamentally, they are the same forces that had for centuries held men in bodily slavery and spiritual degradation and had impressed upon the relations among nations a state of anarchy, of reliance upon armed force, of complete absence of any kind of safety and security.

Mankind is tragically confronted once more by the alternatives of freedom or serfdom, of order or anarchy, of progress or retrogression, of civilization or barbarism.

Let there be no illusion. The alternatives are real and concrete not only in the portions of the world lying in the

immediate vicinity of the countries in which these resurgent forces find their organized expression; they loom threateningly throughout the world. Their ominous shadow falls athwart our own hemisphere.

In the face of this threat, it is our most important duty to ourselves and to humanity to maintain and preserve inviolate our own institutions and the beliefs on which they rest. It is imperative that the 21 republics of the Western Hemisphere proclaim, unequivocally and unmistakably, their profound belief that only the type of national organization and of international relationship which we and the rest of mankind have been persistently and laboriously building up in the course of recent generations can make it possible for nations to advance materially and culturally, and for man to be free. It is imperative that our peoples rededicate themselves to the ideals which actuated the founders of our respective nations. It is imperative that our generation should find again that clarity of vision, that tenacity of purpose, and that heroic determination which led our forefathers to stake their all—to make every sacrifice, if need should be—for the assertion of human rights and creation and maintenance of free popular government.

The characteristics which our nations have in common and which have already rendered possible in the Western Hemisphere a recent course of developments different from those which have occurred in many other parts of the world, are powerful factors in enabling us to perform this duty. Toward that end we must work unremittingly.

Each and all of us desire passionately to live at peace with every nation of the world. But there must not be a shadow of a doubt anywhere as to the determination of the American nations not to permit the invasion of this hemisphere by the armed forces of any power or any possible combination of powers. Each of our nations obviously must decide for itself what measures it should take in order to meet its share of our common interest and responsibility in this respect. As far as my country is concerned, let no one doubt for a moment

that, so long as the possibility of armed challenge exists, the United States will maintain adequate defensive military, naval, and air establishments.

At the same time, we all know that armed force is not the only instrumentality by which nations can be conquered. Equally, the dissemination by nations of doctrines and the carrying on of other types of activity can be utilized for the purpose of undermining and destroying in other nations established institutions of government and basic social order. Such activities are based on the fallacious theories of class or racial superiority, or claims to national dominance, which are being revived again in some parts of the world.

There is no place in the Western Hemisphere for a revival of such doctrines and theories, which our nations, in common with an overwhelming majority of civilized mankind, rejected long ago.

Each and all of us desire to maintain friendly relations with every nation of the world—resting upon the basis of mutual respect for national independence, upon noninterference in the internal affairs of others, upon fair dealing in every phase of international relationships. But there should not be a shadow of a doubt anywhere as to the determination of the American nations not to permit the invasion of this hemisphere from any quarter by activities contrary or inimical to this basis of relations among nations. Here again, with a full consciousness of our common interest and responsibility, each of our nations must decide for itself what measures it should take in order to meet these insidious dangers.

All this is of surpassing importance. And yet, adequate defense against actual or potential danger is not enough as the objective of responsible statesmanship. There is equal or even greater need for unstinted effort in the direction of removing the causes of danger and of opening the way for the constructive processes of human progress. The conditions which confront us require also a vigorous program of positive action.

In an important measure, such a program already exists. It is the fruitful result of inter-American conferences held in the past and of the influence exerted upon the life of our hemisphere by these periodic exchanges of views and by the agreements which we reach on vital problems. The Conference in which we are again assembled now as representatives of the American nations offers a timely and precious opportunity for advancing and perfecting this indispensable program of assuring the solidarity, security, independence, prosperity, and progress of the Americas and of making our individual and joint contribution to the peace and well-being of the world.

IV

Our Conference must carry forward the work of building an enduring structure of peace. It is within the power of the American nations to furnish a conclusive demonstration that peace, based on justice, law, and cooperative effort, is unquestionably feasible. To that end, we must examine anew the existing instruments of peace, by which we are all bound to a system of pacific settlement, and give our best thought to every possible method of perfecting further the inter-American machinery of peace.

Our Conference must devote sincere effort to discovering the means of strengthening the foundations of international law. At a time when the structure of world order under law is being undermined and impaired in many parts of the globe, the very highest responsibility rests upon us to keep alive those fundamental principles of relations among nations upon which alone such order can be maintained. The right of each nation to manage its own affairs free from outside interference; recognition of the sovereignty and equality of states irrespective of size and strength; respect for the pledged word and the sanctity of treaty obligations—these and numerous other basic principles must be the governing rules of international conduct if peace rather than anarchy is to prevail, and civilization is to advance.

Our Conference must extend and make more secure the bases of sound and healthy economic relations among nations. Excessive trade barriers and other obstacles to the flow of mutually profitable international commerce still weigh heavily upon the economic life of the world—on our continent, as well as elsewhere. Nations cannot prosper and provide for their populations a full measure of stable employment and a rising standard of living if international trade is destroyed by suicidal attempts at autarchy or is impaired by being forced into the artificial channels of narrow bilateralism or exclusive regionalism. And just as production cannot be expanded and improved by a return to hand operation, so trade cannot be fostered by a reversion to the primitive forms of physical barter. Only through a liberalization of trade relations, through a reduction of excessive trade barriers, through a firm establishment of equality of commercial treatment, can the exchange of goods among nations play its vital and indispensable role of enhancing the prosperity and stability of national economies.

The removal of excessive trade barriers and the restoration of the trade process to a basis of equality of commercial treatment and commercial opportunity is today a task of the utmost importance. Unless the nations of the world can achieve this task, the prospect for economic and social improvement and stability within nations must remain dark indeed. Our Conference should examine every feasible method of aiding in the successful performance of this task—among ourselves, as well as between each of us and the rest of the world. We seek to restore mutually profitable trade to the fullest practical extent both among the American nations and among all the nations of the world.

Our Conference must carry forward the work of providing wider and stronger foundations for international cultural relations and better understanding among nations—again, among ourselves, as well as between each of us and the rest of the world. This work of moral disarmament, already far advanced on the American Continent, is indispensable for

the creation and maintenance of a civilized world order under law. It is an important vehicle for strengthening and developing those innumerable international relationships in every phase of human activity through which the lives of nations have already been vastly enriched.

The American nations, with the cooperation of some of the nations of the other hemisphere, are faithfully carrying forward the program of principles underlying world order, peace, and economic restoration, which I have fully summarized. The success of this program is indispensable to the welfare and progress and civilization of the human race. For each and every nation the establishment of these principles throughout the world would bring immense benefit, as any alternative policy resting on force must bring each and every one disaster.

Each nation has a sincere standing invitation to join in approval and support of this program of principles. It would be an unspeakable calamity if any nation at this crucial and critical time in the affairs of men should further pursue the opposing course of force and military aggression. Here is presented the greatest single issue confronting all peaceful nations. We shall not lose sight of it for a moment as we grapple with the vital questions peculiar to this hemisphere.

The world's greatest need today is that there be created and maintained conditions which will give to nations and to individuals peace of mind and of spirit. Toward producing those conditions, we must strive with all our strength in every field—political, social, economic, and moral. Only as favorable conditions develop in all these fields, will the way be open for a reversal of the present-day trend in military armaments, which impose so crushing a burden upon the lives of nations and individuals and open before mankind the horrible vista of a marvelous civilization crashing into ruin under the impact of a period of all-destroying warfare.

We of the Americas are fortunate beyond words in being so situated that we can make our example and our influence a potent factor in promotion of conditions in which there

may be peace with justice and with security. Nor do we stand alone. There are in other parts of the world powerful forces, actual or latent, working toward the same end.

We must not bring the labors of this Conference to a conclusion without providing a renewed basis of hope and a renewed determination—not only for our own nations, but for all other nations or groups within nations, which, at times against great odds and in the face of heart-breaking difficulties, are working for a better world.

THE FOREIGN POLICIES OF ROOSEVELT¹

ALBEN W. BARKLEY

This argument by Senator Barkley, Senate leader of the Democratic party, was given on March 7, 1939, at the end of a week's heated Senate debate on the issue of national defense.

The Upper Chamber had before it the Army Expansion Bill. The House had approved in short order the regular War Department appropriation calling for an expenditure of half a billion dollars.

The President's emergency national defense program, as recommended in his special message to Congress on January 12, 1939, had gone through the House practically intact except for the elimination of the Guam submarine base. This bill was in two sections: one for the Army, another for the Navy. The Army section, involving an appropriation of \$358,000,000, to be spent chiefly in increasing the Army air force wing to 6000 planes, first came up for Senate consideration. The members seized upon the bill proposing an unprecedented peace time emergency defense program, as an excuse to debate the administration's foreign policy. Issues of maintaining neutrality, applying sanctions against aggressors, supporting democratic countries, and of voting huge expenditures for defense were battled back and forth.

The length of Senator Barkley's argument, interrupted as it was by remarks from Clark, of Missouri, Norris, of Nebraska, Johnson, of California, and others, prevents its complete inclusion here. The first section is reprinted in full. At the conclusion of the discussion the Senate passed the bill (H. R. 3791) with 77 yeas, 8 nays, and 11 not voting.

Mr. President, I do not intend to quote from it, but only to refer to the annual message of the President to the Congress of the United States delivered on the 4th day of last January, which fits into the policy that he announced in Chautauqua, the policy that he announced on the 4th of March, 1933, the policy that he announced in Chicago in 1937, and his foreign policy epitomized in the excellent statement he gave out to the press only a few weeks ago.

What is that policy?

¹ Congressional Record. 84: no 46:3339-43, March 7, 1939. By permission of the author.

On the 22d day of January we heard read the great and immortal address of George Washington, in which he counseled us against entangling alliances. Most of us quote Washington and most of us quote Jefferson as the devil quotes the Bible for his own purposes, and frequently leaves out the most significant quotations in the context of that which we desire to use. Jefferson is frequently quoted as having remarked that "that government is best that governs least," without any regard to the context of what Jefferson was talking about. He was talking about an ideal society in which all men recognize the rights of all other men, and said that in such a society the least government is the best government, because it inflicts its orders and its regulations in the smallest possible degree upon the people over whom that government reigns. But in one of his great letters, written in 1824 or 1825, only a year or two prior to his death, Jefferson said he believed that all constitutions ought to be changed every 20 years, that there ought to be automatic provisions in them for their change, because he said no dead generation has any right to bind a living generation. Nobody ever quotes that from Jefferson.

In his Farewell Address, George Washington counseled us against permanent entangling alliances, and then almost in the same breath said we may rely upon temporary alliances in particular emergencies for the protection of the rights of the United States.

Mr. President, so far as I recall, we have never had an entangling alliance with any nation, either permanent or temporary. When, in response to the call of liberty and justice, in 1898 we fought the Spanish-American War, although the immediate occasion for the declaration of war was the blowing up of the battleship *Maine* in the harbor of Habana, fundamentally that situation arose out of the desire of the American people to abolish a festering sore of brutality and iniquity and despotism in the Western Hemisphere; but there was no alliance, either before, during, or after that war.

There was no alliance with Cuba. There was no alliance with any South or Central American nation. There was no alliance with the Philippine Islands. There was no alliance in the World War; but, if there had been, it would not have been in violation of the Farewell Address of George Washington, because, while inveighing against permanent alliances and giving the reasons therefor, he in effect counseled temporary alliances whenever the circumstances might justify them, growing out of conditions that might exist at the time. But in spite of the fact that General Washington apparently counseled temporary alliances, there has never been even a temporary alliance between the United States and any other nation that bound us to engage in armed conflict, to go to war to protect them or to protect anybody else, or even ourselves. We entered into the World War as the result of conditions that had accumulated for two and one-half years. We were associated with the Allies in the prosecution of that war, but there was no alliance, either openly or secretly, that took us into that war, or bound us by the terms of its conclusion.

We asserted our own independence as a nation when the war had concluded. Whether wisely or unwisely, we need not now debate, we asserted our independence in the matter of the solution of the world problems which came as a result of that war, and finally entered into a separate treaty with Germany and Austria in the settlement of the war.

What is our foreign policy, Mr. President? First, the President said, "We are against any entangling alliances, obviously." Of course we are. We have always been. We have never entered into one. We are not a party to any entangling alliance today, and I daresay that whatever may be the exigencies of our defense in the future, whatever may be the requirements of our National Government to protect not only our people and our liberty and our traditions, but whatever activities we may be called upon to indulge in to protect the Monroe Doctrine, or all the things that are associated with the Monroe Doctrine, it will not be done as the result of any

alliance between our nation and any other nation, but will be done in the protection of our interests, will be done in the protection of our civilization, will be done in carrying out the theory of the Monroe Doctrine, that any effort on the part of any European—or, I might add, Asiatic—nation to gain a foothold in the Western Hemisphere would be regarded as an unfriendly act by the United States. Of course we are opposed to entangling alliances, and the President is opposed to them.

No. 2. "We are in favor of the maintenance of world trade for all nations, including ourselves"

Mr. President, I need not go into any detail in discussing the desire for world trade. I need not call the attention of the Senate and of the country to the indispensability of international trade. There has never been a great nation, commercial or military, which did not have its ships plying the Seven Seas carrying to the waiting hungry, naked, and wanting nations of the world the products of its labor in field and factory.

I need not call attention to the fact that international law has so sanctioned international trade that even in time of war it protects trade carried by the ships of one nation to another nation, subject to certain reservations with respect to contraband of war, and search and seizure of ships, in order to prevent the enemy from obtaining supplies.

I need not expatiate upon the desire of this administration to bring about an increase in world trade. I need not refer to the fact that a decade ago, almost by our own example, barriers were erected around nations declaring themselves self-sufficient, announcing to mankind that they would neither sell nor buy, that they were a land unto themselves, and did not need their neighbors. I need not refer to the disaster which came over the world as a result of that policy, which was followed by other nations after the example had been set by one of the greatest nations in the world.

I need not refer to the fact that our great Secretary of State, Cordell Hull, who will go down in history as one of the

great Secretaries of State of the American Republic, has devoted himself intelligently and patriotically to lowering some of these artificial barriers, so that the products of mankind may find distribution among those who need them and do not have them. Of course, we believe in international trade.

No 3. "We are in complete sympathy with every effort made to reduce or limit armaments."

Can anyone deny that? Can anyone deny that we took the initiative soon after the World War, through our Secretary of State, now the great Chief Justice of the United States, to assemble here in Washington a conclave representing the great nations of the world in an effort to relieve the tax-burdened men and women of the world of taxation, and the burdens of armaments, in order that we might escape from the incentive or the inducement to war? And when that conclave had concluded its deliberations and had entered into a treaty providing for the 5-5-3 ratio as between the United States, England, Japan, and others, we rejoiced in the belief, we were spurred on with the hope, that, after all, there had come a reversion in the trend of international relationships, and that the suffering men and women of the world who are not responsible for war or for its disasters or its hazards or its catastrophes might, after a while, lift their bended backs and look the sun in the face, and feel that, after all, civilization and Christianity had come to their relief in lifting these burdens from their shoulders. How we rejoiced in the consummation of that treaty. Can anyone deny or doubt that it has been our policy from the beginning to encourage the limitation of armaments?

Then, when the Nine Power Treaty was entered into, and when, under the leadership of a great French statesman, Aristide Briand, and another great American Secretary of State, Mr. Frank B. Kellogg, nearly all the nations of the world entered into an agreement to abolish war as a means of advancing their national policy, those of us who love peace and hate war, those of us who desire to see the inventive genius of mankind converged upon the solution of social

and economic problems, those of us who desire to take away the slavery from children in future generations who are in advance committed to a policy which may result in war, again shouted our hosannas and our hallelujahs across the world, which recognized the futility of war, because it had entered into an agreement encompassing nearly all the nations of mankind to abolish war as a means of national policy. No one can deny that it has been our policy to advocate limitation of armaments.

No. 4 Said the President—

"As a nation, as American people, we are sympathetic with the peaceful maintenance of political, economic, and social independence of all nations in the world"

No one can deny that statement. No one can controvert the assertion that that is our policy, and has always been our policy, though at times in the past historians have criticized the course of the American Republic in marching across the Western Hemisphere and taking into its arms the body of the midcontinent between the two oceans. When the War with Spain was over, there were those in our country who announced that they were in favor of a policy which would take us on to Panama, on to Mexico, on to Central America, and when the Panama Canal had been completed there were important people in this country who advocated our taking every foot of land between here and Panama, in order that there might never be any occasion for any foreign nation to set foot upon the part of America which might be contiguous to the Panama Canal.

Happily we have followed no such policy; happily we do not believe in any such policy, and happily there is not a foot of land in the Western Hemisphere which we desire from any nation. Yet, as the Senator from Idaho stated a few days ago, the Monroe Doctrine is a doctrine which was instigated and inspired by an enlightened selfishness

I do not believe there is any considerable body of American sentiment which would be in favor of the abandonment of the Monroe Doctrine, for if in 1823 the obtaining of a

foothold by any other nation in the Western Hemisphere could have been regarded as an unfriendly act on the part of that nation toward the United States, certainly today it would be more dangerous than it was 116 years ago for any such nation to obtain a foothold in the continent of America.

So, Mr. President, I do not think it is necessary for us meticulously to examine the statements of our Government in order to prove that our foreign policy is a policy inspired by the desire for peace, and yet a policy inspired by the desire to protect and defend democracy, under which we have lived for 150 years, for the inauguration of which our ancestors did not fear to fight, and for the preservation of which our people for 150 years have been willing to make whatever sacrifice might be necessary not only to preserve democracy for ourselves, but to advance it among the people of the world.

DRAFTING OF WEALTH IN TIME OF WAR ¹

JOSHUA BRYAN LEE

Senator Lee delivered this speech in the Senate on Tuesday, February 28, 1939, upon renewal of debate on the bill (H.R. 3791) to provide more effectively for the national defense by carrying out the recommendations of the President in his message of January 12, 1939. Senator Clark of Idaho gave a lengthy and eloquent indictment of war. Senator Lee, following immediately, talked more specifically in defense of the amendment to provide for 6000 airplanes. His address was one of the ablest of this first session of the Seventy-Sixth Congress. At its conclusion he introduced, for reference to the Military Affairs Committee, a bill (S 1650) "to promote peace and the national defense through a more equal distribution of the burdens of war by drafting the use of money according to ability to lend to the Government."

Mr President, the primary purpose of this bill is to provide a means of financing war. It has several purposes. One is to prevent profiteering. One is to supply the necessary sinews of war. Every nation that depends upon the voluntary system of financing a war, if the war last long, finds itself confronted with the necessity of issuing paper fiat money, and breaks down its own financial system. Great Britain came nearer financing a war on the pay-as-you-go basis than any other nation has yet done, and Great Britain was able to pay only 36 per cent; and by the time the war ended, Great Britain was paying five per cent interest on her bonds on the voluntary basis. The longer a war goes, the darker the future looks, the more difficult it is to coax enough money out of hiding to finance the war. Therefore, there should be a law that will compel the financial support of a war which is just as strict and just as rigid as the law that compels the manpower of a country to support the war.

¹ Congressional Record. 84: no 40-2829-2832, February 28, 1939. By permission of Senator Lee.

That is what is provided by the bill I have introduced. It provides for a draft of capital. There are only two ways in which the Government can get money from the people. One is to borrow it from them, and the other is to take it away from them. If we take it away from them, that is taxes, in which event we do not intend to give it back. There are two kinds of loans. One is voluntary, and the other is mandatory. This bill provides for a mandatory loan in proportion to each individual's ability to pay; and it limits the interest rate to one per cent, instead of letting it rise with each successive issue of bonds, with the result that the longer the war goes, the higher the interest rate becomes. The bill prevents profiteering in the field of financing war.

We have already paid \$12,000,000,000 of interest alone on the bonds of the last war, and we cannot touch any of that money by taxation, because it is tax-exempt. We cannot reach the profits of financing war when it is financed with tax-exempt, voluntary bonds. This bill provides a method of financing war on a basis as mandatory as the law which calls men to the colors.

We cannot pay as we go in case of war. France tried it. France was able to pay only 17 per cent, and she broke her economic fabric and ruined her franc. Germany ruined her mark, and broke down inside before she broke down on the Hindenburg line. Therefore, while we are considering methods of national defense that cost money, this is a method of national defense that would not cost us a dime, and I hope it can be brought before this body this year and passed. It would strengthen us. It would have a tremendous psychological effect upon a foreign foe, when they look upon America as a potential victim, to see on the books a statute, a sleeping giant that would rise to strength upon the declaration of war, that would give the Government power to finance a war to the full extent of America's ability to pay. Then it would have a tremendous effect in causing any nation which is too ambitious to pause before declaring war upon the United States. It would mean that the United

States could get money without delay or embarrassment. It would mean that there would be no unconscionable profits after the war. It would mean that every soldier who served would feel that the money that paid for his clothes and his ammunition and his food was not a subject for profiteering. It would strengthen America in the eyes of the people, who were so disgusted with the unconscionable profits that resulted from the last war that they swore down in their hearts that they would look twice before they supported any future war if it meant filling the pockets of certain interests as the last war did.

It would strengthen us, in my opinion, more than these airplanes would strengthen us to pass a bill that would say to the financier, "If we have war it is going to cost you. If we have war, it may break you." It would simply put them on notice that if there is war, there will be no profits.

At the time of the last war we borrowed 50-cent dollars and paid back 100-cent dollars, or 136-cent dollars, as my colleague the senior Senator from Oklahoma [MR. THOMAS] has pointed out. When we borrowed those dollars, due to inflation, a dollar would buy only 50 cents worth of goods. We borrowed 50-cent dollars. We paid back, after things became more normal, 136-cent dollars, with the result that there came the tremendous profits in the financing of the war, which we cannot touch, under any voluntary system of raising money from tax-exempt bonds.

Why have a voluntary system for raising money any more than have a voluntary system for raising an army of men? The War Department, over the signature of Assistant Secretary of War Louis Johnson, says that a war, in order to be successful, must have the support of the people, therefore they do not favor my proposal, because if we have the support of the people, we can get the money. Why would not the same argument apply to the raising of an army, if it applies to the raising of money?

Ex-service men, who know war better than anyone else, have, since the close of the last war, asked for a bill to draft

capital. Every ex-service organization has gone on record time and again for a bill which would draft capital in case of war.

The argument is advanced by certain people who do not want such a bill that we do not need it, that we can raise the money. We can raise it, and then we can pay the tremendous profits.

While we were in France serving for a dollar a day and a chance to die, 22,000 millionaires were made in this country, according to the statement of the chairman of the Senate Munitions Committee [MR. NYE]. That is what is in the minds and craws of the people of this country regarding war. It is not that any red-blooded Americans—and they are all red-blooded—would object to a defense sufficient to protect us from aggression. It is merely that we were so sickened by the story of the profits made during the last war that we are gun-shy when it comes to appropriations of money for war materials or to defend our country against an aggressor.

Mr. President and Senators, I say that if we pass legislation such as the bill I have just introduced, which will prevent profits from war, it will do more to gain the support of the people of the United States behind a program of national defense than any other thing we can do.

We ought to go a step further and pass one of the bills recommended after the Senate Munitions Committee hearings. Several Senators have such bills. The Senator from Texas [MR. CONNALLY] has such a bill, and one was introduced by the Senator from North Dakota [MR. NYE], the Senator from Missouri [MR. CLARK], the Senator from Washington [MR. BONE], and the Senator from Michigan [MR. VANDENBERG]. I have joined several Senators in introducing such a bill, a bill which calls for a tax which will recover the profits which result from war. We can reach all the profits in war in that way, except profits which result from financing the war, and we cannot reach them because the bonds representing them are tax exempt and the interest from them is

tax exempt. That is why I am arguing today for a measure which will increase our national defense without a dime of cost. Such a bill would tend to equalize the burdens of war.

In the last war we drafted men but we begged for money. We called men to the colors by law. We bed them by grace. We raised an army of men by force; we supported them by supplication—an outrage to the majesty of the flag itself.

The Constitution provides that "Congress shall have power to declare war," and, skipping some provisions, "to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers." And what was provided among the "foregoing powers"? They provided that Congress shall have the power "to raise and support an army," and the supporting of an army is just as much a part of the Constitution as is the raising of an army. There is the constitutional mandate for raising the finances of war by as much force as that employed in raising the manpower. When we do that, people will no longer worry about the unconscionable profits which result from war. Such profits were made in the last war, as they were made in the Civil War, and as will happen in the next war unless we do something now to prevent it.

I thank the Senate,

FOR AN ADEQUATE DEFENSE ¹

GERALD P. NYE, JR

This speech was delivered in the Senate on February 28, 1939. Senator Nye, immediately followed Senator Lee (see preceding speech), and recalled the debate to the bill before the House, on national defense. The Senator occupied the floor the remainder of the day, yielding frequently to his colleagues. The section of his day's debate which follows is typical of his treatment of the theme. This subject Mr. Nye has repeatedly and with great rhetorical success discussed in the Senate and over the air, during the past twelve months. For the outcome of the debate see the Introduction to Senator Barkley's speech, *supra*

Mr. President, until the recent departure from that spirit of fear which gripped the country for so long, coolness and common sense have had anything but a right-of-way in our considerations. We have been fearing that we were unprepared for emergencies which might arise, and now, in light of all the preparing we have done, especially of more recent years, one is wont to ask when in the world we are ever going to be adequately prepared? Senators will remember that during these winter months representatives of the Government were talking, not of 5,500 and 6,000 planes, but of 10,000 planes or 15,000 planes, of 20,000 planes. Were we to have that number of planes today there would still be an element of the people who would be counting our national defense wholly inadequate.

A year or two years before we entered the World War, the war that was going to be the last war, it was costing us in the neighborhood of \$300,000,000 a year to maintain a national defense. This year the cost will be close to \$2,000,000,000; and yet as large a proportion of our people are dissatisfied, fearful about the adequacy of our national defense, as were dissatisfied back in 1913, 1914, and 1915.

¹ Congressional Record. 84: no 2833-50, February 28, 1939. By permission of Senator Nye.

I have greater respect today for the American Military Establishment than I have ever entertained before. Except for the manner in which our military leaders stood up last winter against odds and fought against some rather uncertain proposals, only Heaven knows what the Congress would be confronted with at this time. The Army can be said very definitely to have stopped a stampede that was on its way to a very definite goal.

As I have said, there has not been coolness and common sense entertained of late months. There has come through the winter the urge to repeal the neutrality law, or to amend it so as to give more power to someone to determine what the neutrality law ought to be made to operate against, or what it ought to be made to operate for—all of it all the while in the name of neutrality.

Mr. President, before men give themselves to the cause of repeal of the neutrality law, at least there ought to be willingness to afford the law a chance to demonstrate how much of a success it may be, or how much of a failure it may be. The truth of the matter is that it has not been given such a chance. There have been opportunities, there have been chances to invoke the neutrality law where it might have demonstrated itself, but that has not been done. In connection with consideration of any proposal to repeal or amend the neutrality law, I wish that Americans might remember what was the first purpose of that law. Its first purpose was to serve the interests of the United States at peace, and the interests of no foreign nation or nations at war.

Then, too, Mr. President, to demonstrate our uncertainty, the absence of any coolness, or the exercise of common sense, this winter has seen secret session after secret session, secret concealed operations after secret concealed operations, until the United States has been put in a state of jitters over what must be involved.

Calling the Military Affairs Committees of the two Houses together to hear the Ambassadors from London and Paris could not have had any other effect. I do not know

what was its purpose, but it could not have had any other effect than to cause an uncertainty of mind, to open up the American mind, and make it ready to receive a terrific program of armament.

We have talked now of militarizing the Civilian Conservation Corps. We spend most madly for a peacetime preparation, when we cannot even hope to pay for such preparation out of the revenues of the Government being raised at this stage. We call every proponent of less hysteria "pro-Nazi." We make it difficult for critics to criticize any direction which might be pursued by our Government. Some people call the critics boobs and liars. When all the activities of this last winter are taken together one is inclined to look around and wonder where George Creel may be concealed somewhere. It is time now to be hearing about some intercepted secret documents passing between dictators and other republics of this hemisphere. It is about time to be hearing that the dictators are cutting the fingers off of children, and mutilating the bodies of mothers, women, and children in other parts of the world. That has been the stage which has been in the making this winter, it seems to me, and I for one am glad to see the American people catching up with it, and to see a breaking away, as we are witnessing a departure from the fear which has been gripping the country for a number of months past.

Mr. President, what is it we are aiming at by this proposal to build 5,500 or 6,000 planes? Why must we have that number of planes? What is it we are preparing for that requires any such national defense as that? One can only conclude that it must be the alleged preparation on the part of the dictatorships to conduct a war from the air. There is vast difference of opinion as to what is, for example, Germany's ability today.

Major Elliott, an authority, declares that it is his belief that Germany's maximum of air strength today is about 3,500 planes. Concurring with him in that opinion is a leading

British air authority by the name of C. G. Gray, who also estimates Germany's air force at approximately 3,500 planes.

Recently I read an account of a debate in the French Chamber of Deputies, revealing the belief there that Germany possesses somewhere between 3,000 and 5,000 planes. In the United States we have had an education all this winter to the effect that Germany has at least 9,000 or 10,000 planes. Is that what we are aiming at? Mr. President, if Germany has 10,000 active combat planes, it does not follow that we, from the standpoint of providing an adequate national defense, must needs have 10,000 combat planes. If our home, instead of being the United States, were France or England, I could hardly be as content as I now am with a lesser air force. Yet were I a resident of England or of France, I should not feel that my country had to have 10,000 airplanes to defend itself against a potential enemy that had 10,000 airplanes. That point is conceded by French authorities, who, it seems, have abandoned the thought of trying to match, plane for plane, what Germany, her neighbor, has. The French are bent upon substituting quality for quantity and are quite content in their belief that they will be able successfully to repulse any attack which may come from a neighbor land.

Mr. President, the issue of national defense must of necessity involve primarily the question of foreign policy. It is difficult, if not impossible, for a Congress to provide a national defense if it does not know what the foreign policy is. I insist that this Congress does not know what is the foreign policy of the United States. I insist that from the standpoint of a strict national defense, protecting ourselves against attack, we are not in need of what some authorities are insisting we shall have in the name of national defense, unless those authorities have attached something more than a requirement of national defense to our foreign policy. We say there are no entangling alliances. As I said earlier today, I can point to none that my country has made with a foreign land. Yet I am wondering if there is any difference between

entangling ourselves in foreign alliances and leading causes in which we seek to entangle other governments

We are greatly disturbed about what certain dictatorships are making ready to do. Abroad, on the part of countries for which we are showing a large solicitation, there is comparative calmness; certainly not the same degree of fear that is being expressed in the United States. A few weeks ago the British Prime Minister stood calmly and deliberately before an audience and coolly said, in effect, that it was not Great Britain's ox that was being gored in Europe, but Uncle Sam's. He said that it was not John Bull who had the stakes in the ring, but that it was Uncle Sam whose stakes were involved.

The British Prime Minister said, in effect, that perhaps the time has come for Britain to stand with the United States in the cause of defending democracy the world over. It has one wondering, if there is to be another war, whose war it is to be, whether it is to be Britain's or whether it is to be ours. One would guess, if he listened to leadership abroad, that if there is to be another war for democracy, the war must be led by the United States, with the privilege in the United States, of course, of meeting the entire cost of operation.

I am more and more convinced that there will be no war in Europe this spring, this year, or next year, unless the United States encourages, urges, and eggs Europe on to it. There will be no war in Europe unless the United States shows a definite will to help out when war comes, and an inclination to finance it. There will surely be a war in Europe when the United States gives the word "Go" and gives Europe reason to anticipate that the United States will be standing by and ready to go on when the hour comes.

. . . I regret that the interruptions of the afternoon have occasioned my taking as much of the time of the Senate as I have taken. In conclusion I once again wish to voice my desire to see the United States of America afforded an adequate national defense sufficient to repulse any attack by any

foreign foe or group of foes, to repulse any attack upon the North American Continent or the South American Continent; but I insist there is no threat inviting the degree of madness which is involved or has been involved this winter in our consideration of the question of providing an adequate national defense.

I am not disposed to believe that America needs 5,000 or 6,000 planes. Where is the threat that is calling for such an outlay, for such a number of planes within the next two years? I fail to see it. I wish and I hope that somehow opportunity will be afforded to win rather material amendments to the pending bill that will reduce the number of planes, to be built under the present plan for national defense, to such a point that we can have consistent output within the next year at least, and then be sure that we are not tying our hands in such a way that a year from now we will find ourselves with a lot of obsolete planes on our hands, when new devices are ready for development which would give us the greatest advantage if only we could possess ourselves of them then.

REARMAMENT¹

BENNETT CHAMP CLARK

Senator Clark gave this debate on March 3, 1939, as part of the "fervid oratory," as Senator Minton put it, "which would lead one to believe that the matter before the Senate at the present time was a resolution declaring war." Senator Nye, earlier in the day, continued his line of attack as illustrated in his speech of February 28th. Senator Holman replied. Senator Clark finally obtained the floor and through a series of interruptions developed an able criticism of the proposal for 6000 planes. Senator Lee replied and so closed the debate for the day. For the vote on March 7th, see the Introductory Note to Senator Barkley's speech.

Mr. President, I desire particularly to address myself to a discussion of the committee amendment No. 1, which represents the increase—as I see it, without rhyme or reason—in the number of planes authorized by the pending measure, from 5,500 to 6,000. I shall attempt presently to show that the increase is not supported by any evidence whatever adduced before either the House Committee on Military Affairs, or the Senate Committee on Military Affairs, and represents simply a gratuitous attempt on the part of the Army and the supporters of a tremendous armament of taking an additional bite.

Before I enter into a discussion of the committee amendment, however, Mr. President, in view of the range which the debate has taken, I deem it proper to make a few expressions of my own views with regard to the implications of the bill as regards our general military policy and our general foreign policy.

Mr. President, I am in favor of adequate national defense. I take it that every patriotic American, except a few misguided but patriotic individuals, who may conceive that it is

¹ Congressional Record 84: no 43-3137-43, March 3, 1939. By permission of Senator Clark.

possible for any nation to throw away all of its arms and trust simply to the general good will—I take it that every patriotic American, except those few individuals, is in favor of adequate national defense.

Mr. President, we come down then to the question of what is adequate national defense. As has been asked several times in the present debate on the floor of the Senate, For what is the defense to be adequate? Before proceeding to the discussion of this particular amendment, Mr. President, I should like to record my view that the only purpose for which our national defense should be adequate, the only purpose for which we are justified in making authorizations or appropriations, is for the defense of the United States itself.

Mr. President, I do not believe that the United States, under any theory whatever, is justified in using the money of the taxpayers of the United States to provide an army and a navy and an aviation force for the purpose of policing the sea lanes for the protection of the British Empire or the French Empire, or for the protection of the possessions of any foreign country whatever.

Mr. President, if we are willing to maintain a sufficient naval and military force to enable us to conduct a war 7,000 miles away from home, let us say in China—which, according to all naval authorities, would require us to provide a navy at least three times as big as Japan's, and to maintain an overwhelming military force—if we are going to have any contemplation of doing a thing like that, any provision we have ever made for naval and military forces, or anyone that has ever been suggested in this country, would be pitifully inadequate.

If we propose to fight a war in China to protect Great Britain in its possession of Hong Kong, which Great Britain wrested from the Chinese in the infamous "opium war" by precisely the same methods by which Japan has been taking territory in China during the past three or four years; if we intend to wage war in Africa to protect France in her posses-

sion of Tunisia, which France acquired by precisely the same methods by which Italy acquired Ethiopia; we are going to need both an army and a navy and an air force far greater than anyone in this country has ever dared propose

If we are going to police the sea lanes to protect the "great democracies of the world," so-called, in the possession which they have asserted and maintained by force, there is no limit to the expenditures of men and blood and money and debt which the United States will be called upon to make.

On the other hand, if we are going to stay at home and attend to our own business, if we are going to be prepared to repel aggression from any source whatever on the United States and our immediate possessions which make up the defense system of the United States, then it seems to me we are being led into a situation of hysteria in which we might very readily appropriate a great deal more money and make a great deal more preparation than would be reasonably necessary.

Mr. President, I abhor as much as does anybody on this floor, or anybody in the United States, the idea of dictatorship, whether it is in Germany or Italy or Russia or anywhere else. I hate the treatment of the Jews in Germany. I hate the treatment of Christians in both Germany and Russia. I hate the methods of murder anywhere. It is very much more agreeable to my conceptions of governmental practice and of proper government for me to observe the so-called democracies of England and France than to observe the dictatorships, whether Communist or Fascist. But it is to be remembered, Mr. President, when we talk about these democracies, and the obligation we owe to these democracies to defend them and protect them, that so far as their international relations are concerned, so far as the conquest of lesser peoples is concerned, the great democracies of Great Britain and France have been as imperialistic and as ruthless in their oppression of minorities and in their subjugation of weaker peoples as any nation that has ever existed in the world.

I can remember, when I was a boy, that I used to go down to the old Columbia Theater on F Street—which was then a new theater, the best in town, in those days—nearly every Sunday afternoon to hear some of the leading American statesmen and publicists inveigh on the subject of "John Bull's crime." That was the subjugation of the Transvaal Republic under old "Oom Paul" Kruger by the ruthless, imperialist British Government.

So I say, Mr. President, that as between the so-called democracies and the so-called dictatorships, my sympathy is entirely with the so-called democracies; I wish them well; but I am not willing to send one American boy away from the United States to die on foreign fields in quarrels between rival imperialisms which do not concern us.

Mr. President, I heard it said on this floor by an eminent Senator whom we all respect, and for whom we all have affection, "I am not afraid to fight a foreign war. I am not afraid to send all the boys in the United States to fight on foreign fields." Mr. President, I am not so brave. I am afraid. I, myself, am not afraid to go again; but I am afraid of the suggestion being made on this floor and in other places that it is justifiable to send American boys halfway around the world to die to protect the paltry investments of the Standard Oil Co., or to die to protect England or France or any other foreign country in any of its suzerainty over subject peoples.

Mr. President, more than twenty years ago, just before the entrance of the United States into the World War, I sat in a room in the Senate wing of the Capitol, the room now occupied by the Committee on Naval Affairs but at that time the office of the Committee on Foreign Relations. The great Senator from Missouri, one of my greatest predecessors in this body—a man whose seat I am proud to occupy—Senator William J. Stone, was then chairman of the great Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. I sat in his office in conversation with him. He had been my friend since my early boyhood. I saw him get up and walk over to the window

and stand looking out, and I heard him say, "Bennett, we are going to have a war. I know it. I am going to vote against it. I am not foolish enough to think that my feeble influence will keep us from getting into the war; and it is going to be the worst thing that ever happened to this country." He said, "It is not the lives it will cost, although, God knows, it is enough to break a man's heart to think of boys like you going away. Some of you won't come back. Some of you who do come back will wish to God you had not come back. Some of you will come back wounded and maimed and blinded and worthless for life; but that is not the worst of it." He said, "It is not the money it will cost, although your grand-grandchildren, if you get back and have any, will not see the paying-off of this debt. It is the fact that after the war is over, after we have won the war—and we shall win the war, because we are too big and powerful to get into a war at this stage of the game and not decide it—we shall never again have the same sort of country that we had before."

Mr President, I have thought about that conversation a thousand times; and I think of that conversation on the part of Senator Stone as that of a man who was smit with prophecy, a prophecy which has been too true. We never have had again the same sort of country we had before. We never again will have the same sort of country we had before.

Mr President, war itself is the great enemy, the invincible enemy of democracy, and the invincible enemy of liberalism. Fascism on the one hand and communism on the other are the products of war. When I heard an eminent Senator on this floor on yesterday say that he was not afraid to fight a foreign war, that he was not afraid to send all the boys in this country to fight on foreign shores, I shuddered; not alone because I have three boys of my own; not alone because I have a knowledge and a feeling for the millions of American boys who would be sent away; not alone because I once took boys with me in 1917 and promised their fathers and mothers that I would take care of them, some of whom did not come

back; but more especially, Mr. President, because of my feeling that if the United States were once again to engage in a foreign war we ourselves might win the war against foreign dictatorships and emerge as having lost the war by being ourselves a totalitarian state.

Mr. President, I merely desire to say that I do not want any vote cast for the pending measure, which I regard, in comparison with some of the grandiose schemes proposed by the Assistant Secretary of War and others, as an essentially modest proposal—I do not want a vote for this bill to be taken in any quarter of this country or in any quarter of the globe as being an endorsement of the statements made by the American Ambassador to France, or the President pro tempore of this body, the senior Senator from Nevada [MR. PITTMAN], or the junior Senator from Kentucky [MR. LOGAN] on yesterday, or anyone else, that the United States is or will be at any stage prepared to enter into an alliance or an understanding or any sort of agreement which will justify any nation whatever on the face of this globe in expecting us to come in and rake their chestnuts out of the fire for them.

DEMOCRACY AND PROPAGANDA

WHAT REALLY THREATENS AMERICAN DEMOCRACY? ¹

EDMUND E. DAY

This address President Day of Cornell University gave before the mid-year graduating class of 149 at the University of Buffalo on February 22, 1939. The speech was widely republished, for example, in the *United States News* and in *Vital Speeches*. For editorial comment, see, for example, "The Citizen and Pressure Groups" in the *New York Times* of February 24th, 1939. This speech is selected from many given recently by educators who have attempted an analysis of dangers to democracy.

The ideals of democracy have long been the ideals of the American people. We accept democracy as a matter of tradition. So firmly are we committed to it that in much of our thinking we simply take it for granted. Nevertheless there are growing signs that we are holding our faith in democracy somewhat less assuredly than formerly. More and more frequently questions are being raised. Can democracy be made to work successfully in the rapidly changing social order of the 20th century? Can democracy meet the challenge of the dictatorial governments? Is democracy after all but a passing phase in the never-ending evolution of human society—a phase that properly belongs to the period of unprecedented economic expansion witnessed especially during the 19th century?

Beyond doubt there are real threats to democracy in current world developments. Thomas Mann, in his stirring lecture on the "Coming Victory of Democracy," has stated categorically: "Throughout the world it has become precarious to take democracy for granted—even in America." In what ways, or by reason of what forces is the present position of

¹ Through the courtesy of the author. Text supplied by President Day.

American democracy precarious? This is the question to which I propose to address your attention this morning. No question confronting the American people seems to be quite so important.

In the minds of some, the most serious threat to American democracy lies in the armed forces of the great dictatorships of Europe and the Far East. How can the United States, which has never taken its defenses any too seriously, hope to cope with the huge armies, the powerful navies, the overpowering air forces of a combination of such nations as Germany, Italy and Japan? And how can the American people expect not to be attacked by a combination of such powers when America is in possession of so much of the world's wealth and they of relatively so little? According to this view it is only a question of time—only a question of our turn in the corporative schedule of conquests—when we, like the others, shall be overwhelmed by vastly superior armed forces, and American democracy will be no more.

While this line of reasoning may serve certain political purposes, it remains totally unconvincing. For at least three reasons, we are not likely to be the object of direct attack by the dictatorships under present conditions. First, our geographic position across the great oceans gives us enormous advantages in defense which even modern technology in warfare can hardly overcome. Second, in potentials of man power and material supplies, whatever our state of relative unpreparedness, we are at bottom a most formidable antagonist. Third, we are known to be a nation of indomitable fighters when once we are thoroughly aroused, and no other country, however arrogant, is likely to take the direct initiative in drawing us into war.

No, the dictatorships do not seriously threaten us by direct attack; nevertheless they are a menace to American democracy in two important ways. In the first place, they may in their program of imperial expansion precipitate a general European war. Such a conflict is almost certain to become a world war, with our own country sooner or later a par-

ticipant on the side of the democracies. In the prosecution of such a war we should almost certainly have to abandon for the time being all pretense of maintaining democratic ways of living and transacting business. For the duration of the war, the United States would go authoritarian, like the opposing dictatorships. What would happen afterwards to the form of American government remains to be seen. Would democratic ways of life be restored? Nobody knows. Therein lies one of the dilemmas of democracy. Not to fight may mean the loss of democracy through humiliation and subjugation; to fight may mean the loss of democracy through unavoidable political transformations "to win the war." The dictatorships do threaten American democracy by putting to democracy everywhere this terrible riddle: To fight or not to fight, with the probable loss of democracy either way.

The dictatorships menace American democracy in a second way; namely, in the propaganda they spread. With the Fascists and Nazis, democratic ideals are objects of scorn and contempt. Democracy is an outmoded form of society; the tides of human progress have left it stranded on the dry sands of the dead past. All the charms of innovation and novelty are found in the new authoritarian regimes. Instead of being recognized as relapses into a discarded form of tyranny, they are held up as an example of a 20th century improvement of social organization. All the arts of modern propaganda are used to decry the shortcomings of democracy, and to glorify the accomplishments of authoritarianism. There is danger to American democracy in this if the forces of counter propaganda are not brought effectively into play. The time has passed when it is safe to take democracy for granted.

One of the threats to democracy which is most widely cited lies in the apparent consequences of modern science and technology. It is claimed that democracy could be expected to work, and did in fact work, quite satisfactorily so long as the economic system was predominately rural and agricul-

tural, and in its industrial phase was largely in the hands of individual enterprisers. The expansion of industry and commerce, the development of the modern corporation, the emergence of the great consolidations or trusts, the revolutionary changes in technology, all these are supposed to have set the stage for a different political and social order. Democracy must, in short, now make way for a better form of social organization, just as democracy itself displaced earlier and outmoded forms.

There is much about this argument that carries weight. Changes in the economic situation, notably since the Great War, are flinging a challenge at democracy which is not easily met. Starvation in the midst of plenty, idleness in the face of need, unemployment despite a desire and a capacity for work, these are poisons no body politic can long withstand. If they cannot be substantially eliminated under democracy, an ultimate change in the social order is inescapable.

There is still reason to believe, however, that the major economic problems of the day can be solved under democratic procedures. That a larger measure of wise forward-planning and of subsequent effective control is requisite is self-evident. Excessive concentrations of power certainly have to be avoided; after all democracy depends upon the participation of free men. The resources of government in intelligence, integrity and technical competence have to be substantially enlarged. The people have to gain greater understanding of what can be done, and what cannot be done, economically. These tasks, however difficult, are not impossible, and I, for one, believe democracy is capable of performing them. It is not in this quarter that the more serious threats to American democracy are to be found.

What of corruption and greed in our political life, do these seriously endanger American democratic institutions? The answer is "no." Dishonest practices, upon the whole, appear and reappear in American government with disheartening persistence, but over the years steady improvement

is discernable; and an impressive record of conscientious and faithful discharge of heavy public responsibilities accumulates. Public administration in the United States is largely honest administration, and is progressively becoming more so. We may be discouraged at times that the standards of morality and personal integrity in public life have not risen more rapidly than they have. The fact remains that at this time no serious threat to American democracy comes from this quarter.

Some concern may reasonably be felt, however, over a closely related phase of American life, namely, the character and capacity of popular leadership in the United States of recent years. There appears to be a growing disposition among our so-called leaders to follow rather than to lead. The main idea seems to be to find out first what the voters want and then to serve as their pliant spokesmen. The result is that our political life becomes more and more a competition of interests, less and less a contest of principles. Increasingly we succumb to the attacks of self-seeking or fanatical propaganda. Statesmen who will accept political defeat, if necessary political elimination, for the sake of principle are likely to be thought mid-Victorian. It requires great fortitude to stand against the powerful pressure groups that have come to crowd our political arena, and the qualities of political leadership under the influences of such innovations as the direct primary, the initiative and referendum, the telegram barrage, the radio broadcast, the public opinion survey—to mention only a few of the most potent factors—give certain signs of deterioration. Herein lies a real threat to American democracy. No government dominated by pressure groups and propaganda is likely to serve the purposes of common justice and public well-being, and no democracy is likely to live durably that is not blessed with a wise, fearless and unselfishly devoted public leadership.

All this points to another deep-seated factor that profoundly affects the prospects of our American society. Can we avoid excessive leveling down in our effort to establish

a system of more complete social justice? In endeavoring to eliminate inequitable disparities of human circumstance, it is very easy indeed to provoke sentiments of envy and malice which give rise to measures that over-shoot the mark. Humankind, after all, is not all of one pattern or grade. Individual differences of strength and ability, of industry and courage, are great. It will be a sorry day for democracy when these relatively large individual differences are ignored or seriously neglected in the rewards which society affords for sustained and constructive service. Democracy needs to preserve certain of the differentials of human experience. Extreme equalitarianism is a growing threat to American democratic ideals.

Another factor in American life constitutes a persistent menace; that is, our ready resort to force. In view of the conditions of frontier life, we doubtless come by this national trait naturally enough, the fact remains that it is time we outgrew it. There is a democratic way of dealing with social issues; it involves discussion, persuasion, balloting, acceptance of the ballot results, continuing review, discussion, and if necessary, revision of the earlier action by the same process. This is the peaceful way of getting along together. A resort to violent or coercive ways of dealing with social conflict is a negation of democracy, and an admission that, for some reason, democracy is unable to deal effectively with its current problems. Premier Daladier, in the recent French crisis, had this to say: "For myself, I consider that the best way to defend the republic, and I am a republican like every other man of feeling, is not to tolerate illegality, violence, and disorder." The *New York Times*, commenting editorially upon the French crisis, took the following stand: "Today the eyes of the world are on France. Much more is at stake than the fate of a one-day general strike, or the fate of the forty-hour week, or even the future of the Daladier Government. For what is being tested once more is the ability of one of the great democratic nations of the world to solve its internal problems peaceably. This is to say that what is being tested today in France is the democratic method itself."

"Democracy depends for its successful working on restraint, tolerance and compromise. Democratic government, precisely because it relies rather upon voluntary cooperation than upon force, must in the main enact laws that inspire cooperation rather than provoke resistance. The minority, precisely because democratic laws are passed in this spirit, owes at least its peaceful acquiescence in the final governmental decision, and should seek to change that decision by persuasion and not by defiance.

"But in France in the last few years the spirit of compromise and conciliation has steadily diminished. The Right and Left wings of opinion have been spreading farther apart. A proposal has only to be made by one side to be automatically denounced by the other. Fighting slogans and ultimatums supplant quiet discussion and adjustment."

We Americans take the resort to force too complacently. We neglect to cultivate assiduously the art of dispassionate, critical, fair-minded thinking about social issues. We fail to practice sufficiently the art of calm, open minded, and persuasive discussion of controverted social problems. We must come to see more clearly how indispensable these arts are to the preservation of democracy, and how serious are the possible consequences of their abandonment, in any connection whatever, for the ways of violence and force.

Further threats to American democracy are to be found in the lack of social unity and discipline in our national life. In this respect the authoritarian governments have the democracies at a great disadvantage. They know what they are after—or at least think they do!—and their peoples are thoroughly disciplined to these ends. The driving power which is thus placed at the disposal of the dictators is impressive indeed. Moreover the tonic effects for the individual that are to be had from a general sense of social solidarity must be frankly admitted. Aimlessness is a devastating affliction for individual and nation alike. What the democracies need more than anything else at the moment is a clear consciousness of high purpose that will impart social unity and individual discipline. William James long since referred to

this need as the moral equivalent of war. The dictators have given the phrase an exceedingly concrete current meaning. Will the democracies, seeing more clearly their great role in the upward struggle of humanity, answer the challenge in time?

They will if they can deal effectively with the most serious of all threats to democracy—the indifference, complacency and ignorance of those who have shared democracy's benefits. As I said at the outset, we Americans simply take democracy for granted. We have no awareness of what we would suffer if our democratic privileges were removed. We fail to sense what espionage, terrorism, completely arbitrary and despotic rule would mean to us individually. We make no sustained effort to understand what democracy is. We are prone to think of it as a system of government rather than as a form of human relationships in which men and women of every class and creed live together in peace. We fail to practice democracy in our daily living. We show no determination to make our individual contributions that democracy may be preserved and strengthened. We exhibit no lasting devotion to the common weal. From these deficiencies come the really serious threats to democracy in America.

Happily the nation is astir, and the forces which make for the defense of our free American institutions are at last gathering in formidable array. The cause for which America stands is the cause of humanity. It is a cause that ultimately, whatever the reverses, is bound to prevail. May you young people, in the lives you individually lead in the times that lie ahead, steadfastly keep the faith of those who as founding fathers caught the vision of democracy in America.

STOPPING PROPAGANDA ¹

DOROTHY THOMPSON

This address was given before the American Federation of Women's Clubs (by broadcast) on May 9, 1939. Miss Thompson, during the period of this volume, continued to be one of the few contemporary American women offered "several speaking engagements a day." Some of her recent subjects include "On the Freedom of Assembly," "Save Czechoslovakia," "Woman and International Peace," "On the German Press," "Urging Free Courts." In 1938 she published *Dorothy Thompson's Political Guide*. Her methods of definition, clearly set forth in the book, are not carried out so fully in her speeches. Rather she usually proceeds by personal illustration and highly interesting if journalistic reflection on phases of her problem. This speech should be compared with her "Propaganda in the Modern World," given at the New York Herald-Tribune Forum on Current Problems, October 18, 1935

We are certainly more governed by propaganda than we have ever been in our lifetimes. The propaganda departments of governments are at least as important as their foreign offices and, if reports are to be credited, cost hundreds of millions.

The idea that governments should use the money of the taxpayers to sell themselves to their own people is now so generally accepted that nobody seems to get wrought up about it, even when those governments are democratic governments, like our own. Before the war, the Counsel on Public Relations—which is just a flossy name for a press agent—was unknown in our own government. Today Washington is full of ex-newspaper men attached to every conceivable government agency, whose job it is to prepare hand-outs for the press—little pamphlets, brochures, and even quite handsome books, at the government's expense to tell the people who did or didn't elect them to do a job, just how well they are doing it.

¹ By permission of the author. Text supplied through the courtesy of Miss Thompson and of her secretary, Miss Madeline Walker.

Our Department of Agriculture used once to confine its printed matter entirely to telling farmers how to deal with hoof and mouth disease, how to grow chickens and make them pay, what sort of fertilizer to put on acid soil and what kind would reduce alkalinity and a thousand other sorts of education useful to the farmer.

But now part of its effort is expended to "sell" the Department's policy. We used to think that the voters were capable of judging an administration by its fruits, but that is very old-fashioned indeed. Even the Relief Administration has press agents attached to all its various branches throughout the country, although you would think that if there was anything that didn't require advertising it was Santa Claus

It has always seemed to me that it was the business of a political party to advertise its program, and, if that party is in power, to advertise the results of that program, out of its own party funds, and not to use the money of the taxpayers, who may belong to the opposite party, to "sell" themselves to the voters. Because, obviously, if an administration can draw on the tax funds for promotion purposes, it has an enormous advantage over its opponents

In any country where there is a free press, the use of the tax funds for the promotion of an administration is necessarily limited in its scope. But in the dictatorships, where they not only control the biggest advertising budgets ever heard of in history but the press and radio as well, the propaganda department becomes second in importance only to the police. The two most important individuals in Germany, for instance, are Himmler and Goebbels. Herr Himmler is in charge of the Gestapo, the famous secret police which terrorizes the people into obedience, and Mr Goebbels is in charge of talking them into obedience. Under the dictatorships government propaganda is just as important in controlling the things that are *not* said, as the things that *are* said. Just now, all of Europe is engaged in a gigantic struggle which in its immediate phase takes the form of a war

of nerves. The business of the propaganda department is not only to keep the populace enthusiastic about the government, but to keep it from knowing any unpleasant facts, such as what the national debt and deficit is, and what the external dangers are. Because if the people knew in any general way in what a really bad way they are, heaven knows what might happen to the government.

All dictatorships know that their greatest menace is a free press and free discussion. You have probably noticed that in his last two speeches Hitler has raved against the world press and even accused it of trying to start a world war. The reason for his rage is that no country can be completely severed from the world. Very few Germans can read English or French, but some can; and some English and French publications get into Germany, and so do foreign broadcasts. And what happens is that the people, who are sick and tired of government propaganda, listen to anything that comes from outside with considerably more credulousness than they do to what comes from their own government. On the other hand, nations which *have* free discussion are subjected to a much greater nervous strain, perhaps, than nations which know nothing, or nearly nothing. The democracies have the jitters because they are aware of the dangers. The dictatorships argue that what the people don't know won't hurt them, and that ignorance is bliss.

But this, also, is only true up to a point. When the people begin to see all about them the evidences of collapse, and at the same time to realize that they are being kept in complete ignorance of the facts, they begin to have an awful feeling of impotent rage and despair. There is nothing more demoralizing than sudden, overwhelming disillusionment. That is why it is always wiser for governments to tell the people the exact truth, even if that truth be painful, than to lead them on in a doped condition, until, at last, the truth is realized all at once.

Some of you may remember that we once had a great boom in this country—in the years 1924 to 1929. There

were plenty of people then who knew that the boom was very artificial; that we were actually in a happy delirium of inflation, and some of those people wanted the government to warn the country. But most people in the government thought that telling the truth would be bad for business and would create demoralization. So they kept on spreading optimism, and when the crash came it was all the worse because people had not been expecting it at all.

I admit that to tell the truth is not popular. In the world as it is at present, the truth is not at all pleasant. It happens to be our fate to live in one of those titanic periods of history which are really revolutionary, when the whole structure of society is undergoing profound change; one of those periods when a great many things come to a head—mistakes and crimes and accumulated discontent, whenever the results of man's genius—his science and invention—add a disturbing element.

Everyone naturally wants peace and quiet and the prospect of a nice comfortable life, and anyone who tells him that he is not in the least likely to get it in his lifetime, and that, on the contrary, he must plan to live with the greatest intelligence and self-sacrifice and not expect very much for himself but must try to make a decent world for his grandchildren—anyone who tells him that is likely to be called a calamity howler or a Cassandra. However, in my experience, the people who have the courage to face facts are those who achieve the greatest inner peace.

One can never stop all propaganda, because in one sense all ideas are propaganda. The other day I listened to a discussion of whether propaganda had any place in art, and one man said that freedom from propaganda was the test of art. But I think that is nonsense. The greatest poets who ever lived wrote propaganda—they wrote to further a way of life or a philosophy of life in which they believed. St. Paul was a propagandist, but that doesn't dismiss the thirteenth chapter of first Corinthians. Shakespeare was the greatest of all propagandists for the aristocratic spirit. Walt

Whitman was a great poet and a great propagandist for democracy.

All propagators of ideas are propagandists, and in this sense we are all, constantly, subjected to propaganda. What we need most is to be able to distinguish between kinds of propaganda. And, above all, we ought to be able to trace the sources of propaganda.

Just now, for instance, we are being subjected to an enormous amount of propaganda from foreign countries. That propaganda is concentrated, in the first place, upon influencing our foreign policy. Some of it is very subtle and some of it is very crude; some of it is quite open, and some of it is hidden. But what we ought to bear in mind is that our foreign policy is bound to be in harmony with some portion of this propaganda. Let me give you an illustration: One part of our own population want us to make a common front with Great Britain and France in resisting aggression. In case of war they want us to refuse to sell arms and even essential raw materials to aggressors and to aid the nations which are defending themselves. Inasmuch as Great Britain and France and some of the small countries of Central Europe have no intention of starting a war, but are very much afraid that they will be warred upon, these nations are making propaganda for this policy. But that does not mean that all the people who are advocating the policy are victims of British propaganda.

In the same way, the Germans and Italians and others of the so-called dynamic nations who intend to expand on this earth by fair means or foul, are extremely anxious that the United States should be neutral in *their* sense of the word—that we should give no aid or comfort of any kind to any nation defending itself. So the Germans are making an enormous propaganda in this country in favor of isolation. But that does not mean that all the people who are isolationists are the victims of German propaganda.

Mr. Stimson believes in collective security and in the first policy, so some stupid people are saying he is pro-British.

Professor Beard believes in the second, so some stupid people are saying he is pro-German. Both are honest men, making up their minds according to the best of their knowledge, quite regardless of whether one or another foreign government has the same idea.

There is, of course, another kind of foreign propaganda which is very vicious. It is the foreign propaganda which conceals its source altogether. For instance, at this moment the German government is flooding this country with anti-Semitic literature designed to work up popular feeling against the Jews. The reason that they are doing it is to divide and confuse public opinion here. They never indicate on all the little leaflets that are sent out where they come from. And hiding themselves under anonymity or with fake names of petty organizations that they have captured or set up for their own purposes, they are spreading maliciously untrue statements. People are being told that this country is being flooded with refugees. Actually, this is pure and simple malicious propaganda and not in the least in harmony with the facts. The facts are that the American immigration quotas have not been extended at all, while the conditions under which one can get a quota number have been made more rigorous. Only 42,685 persons entered the United States last year from all the countries of the world, although 153,774 were entitled to come under the quota laws; and in the six years from 1932 to 1938, 4,487 more aliens left this country than were admitted under the immigration laws.

Whenever we get a pamphlet or leaflet designed to influence our opinions, we ought to ask: "Who is responsible for this information?" If it is anonymous, we ought to throw it into the wastebasket right away. If it is not, we ought to ask: "What is this organization? Who is in it? Is he reputable?" And if one cannot find the answer to *that* question, we ought to throw it into the wastebasket. And, finally, we must always ask two more questions: "What is the purpose of this propaganda? And: Are the facts in it true?"

I happen to believe with Lincoln that you can fool some of the people all of the time and all of the people some of the time, but not all of the people all of the time.

In the long run, even the dictatorships will learn that—to their own awful undoing. For there is nothing that so arouses the resentment of people as the realization that they have been lied to and fooled. The first business of any democracy is to protect the Truth—for the protection of the Truth is the protection of itself.

ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL POLICIES

THE NEW DEAL MUST CONTINUE¹

FRANKLIN DELANO ROOSEVELT

President Roosevelt gave this speech at the Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D C., on May 22, 1939, before the Retailers' National Forum, held under the auspices of the American Retailers' Federation. The address was broadcast throughout the nation and invoked wide editorial comment. These White House remarks were generally interpreted as not so much a criticism of retailers, as a fling at the anti-New Deal Democrats. Roosevelt presumably served notice that he would continue his spending program as the main issue in 1940. The members of his party were in effect warned that if they had his backing, they must stand on his platform of continued debt, of continued huge expenditures for relief, of not lowering taxes, of keeping the government in business, of priming the financial pump, of leaving things more or less alone until the national income should increase. The immediate audience response amounted to an "ovation," and the Gallup poll in June showed that 58 per cent of the American public still supported Roosevelt.

I am happy to speak at this first Forum of the American Retail Federation. I feel a kinship between your business and mine. The backbone of the customers we are both trying to satisfy is the same—in your case the many small customers whose steady demand for the necessities and a few luxuries of life make up your volume—in my case millions of average American families whose standard of living is the practical measure of the success of our democracy.

For you who are in the honorable business of storekeeping, the flow of consumer purchasing power determines the difference between red and black on your account books; and for the nation the difference between unemployment and prosperity.

That is why I want to devote this opportunity to a discussion of government fiscal policy in relation to consumer purchasing power.

¹ By permission of President Roosevelt. Text furnished through the courtesy of Secretary to the President, Mr. Stephen Early.

Some highbrow columnists and some high-g geared economists, say that you and I think too much about consumers' purchasing power and look at our economic problems from the wrong end. They say that we should glue all of our attention on the heavy industries, and should do everything and anything just to get these industries to work and to get private investors to put up the money to build new buildings and new machines without regard to the average consumer's need or his ability to use these buildings or machines.

By and large, you will find that these experts are the same as those who in 1929 told us that conditions were sound and that we had found the way to end poverty when we were building luxurious office buildings, hotels and apartment houses which consumers did not need and had not the purchasing power to pay for.

Today in 1939 they tell you that conditions *are not* sound because we are trying to build the sort of houses and other things which our people really need, and because we are trying to make sure that our people have the purchasing power to pay for these things.

They were unrealistic and theoretical when they were prophesying their new era in 1929—they are just as unrealistic and theoretical and wrong—when they are prophesying national bankruptcy in 1939.

To translate this into terms of the retail trade, the shelves of heavy industries in 1929 were seriously overstacked. You know what happens to storekeepers if they buy twice as much as the public can buy from them.

In the last analysis, therefore, consumer buying power is the milk in the cocoanut of all business.

Whether you are a big department store or do business in a small way on the Main Street of a small town, your sales are dependent on how much money the average family in the community earns. That is a homely way of putting it, but it is an eternal truth.

That is one reason why I have talked about the one-third of our population that is ill-clad, ill-housed, ill-fed. That third—forty million people—can buy very little at the stores.

Therefore, their local stores can order very little at the factories. Some of my friends laugh at me when I stress this, laugh at efforts to establish minimum wages. But the little and the big storekeeper understand and know they will sell more goods if their customers have more money. I want, and I think I have your help, to build up the purchasing power of the average of your customers.

How shall we produce more customers with more money?

One school of thought is what I call the school of the gamblers. You find some of them in every community—as well as in Wall Street, and some of them, the political variety, even in the halls of the Congress and State Legislatures.

That school is eager to gamble the safety of the nation and of our system of private enterprise on nothing more than their personal hunch that if government will just keep its hands off the economic system customers will just happen. I use the word "gamble" because there is no modern experience to support their theory.

In fact, modern experience denies their theory. Between 1925 and 1933 government abandoned practically all concern for business and put into effect a tax system such as "Old Dealers" dream about. Customers and the buying power of customers were left just to happen. You know how many and how much happened.

These people who are playing the "it may happen" hunch today are actually the wildest eyed radicals in our midst, because despite proved failures they want to gamble on their own hunch once more.

In the other school of thought we are conservative New Dealers. We are the conservatives because we simply cannot bring ourselves to take radical chances with other people's property and other people's lives.

Now the owner of a private business may have the legal right to take a long chance that may make or break his personal fortune. If he alone goes out of business, the economic system is not endangered.

But the people who run the three branches of our government do not have the moral right to gamble with the well-being of one hundred and twenty million Americans. If millions of citizens starve, it is no answer to the starving to say that in the sweet by-and-by business, left to itself, will give them a job. Partisans are going around the country scaring parents who are not starving by telling them of an increased debt which their grandchildren will have to pay. Certainly that is not as alarming as telling parents who are already starving that an untrammelled business setup will provide their grandchildren with food in 1989. Yet that is what the radical gamblers of business and politics might have to say if they put their theories into practice next year.

Not one of you who are good Americans and practical Americans believes that we could repeat the catastrophe of those years immediately preceding and following 1929 and emerge from it with our economic and social system unchanged. No business man, big or little, can fairly or patriotically ask his government to take a course of action that runs that risk.

That is why our school of thought—the conservative school—holds the view that an intelligent nation should rest its faith in arithmetic rather than in a hunch.

Today, in order to provide customers for business, your government uses government capital to provide jobs, to prevent farm prices from collapsing and to build up purchasing power when private capital fails to do it. For example, out of every dollar spent by the Federal Government to provide jobs, more than fifty cents passes over the counters of the retail merchants of America.

We also use what we call social legislation—such as legislation to encourage better pay for low-paid labor and thereby provide more and better customers for you; such as legislation to protect investors so that they may continue to be your customers without losing their savings in worthless stocks and bonds.

I wonder if you have any conception of the number of business men and bankers and economists whom I talk with briefly or at length in any given month of the year. I wonder if you have any conception of the variety of suggestions and panaceas they offer me. I wonder if you know the very large percentage of them who honestly and very naturally think of national problems solely in terms of their own business. I wonder if you will be surprised if I tell you that most of them leave my office saying to me—"Why, Mr. President, I did not know about that. You have given me a new perspective. I never thought of the problem in that way before."

I sit in my office with a business man who thinks the surest way to produce customers is to balance the federal budget at once. I say to him—"How?"

Sometimes he says—"How should I know? That is your job." Sometimes he says—"Cut the budget straight through 10 per cent or 20 per cent."

Then I take from my desk drawer a fat book and it is apparent at once that he has never seen or read the budget of the Government of the United States.

He tries to change the subject but I hold him to it. I say—"This budget is not all of one piece; it is an aggregate of hundreds of items. Either we will have to cut every item 10 per cent or 20 per cent or, if we do not do this, cut some items very much more than 10 per cent or 20 per cent."

I point out the one and a half billion dollars for the Army and Navy. He pounds the desk and says—"Don't cut that item—not in these days."

I show him the item of a billion dollars for interest on the public debt. He owns some government bonds and rejects any cut in his interest.

I show him the billion dollar item for war and civil service pensions. He says—"No—no cut there."

I mention the billion dollars for running the permanent functions of the regular government departments—they cost less today than under my predecessor. He readily agrees

that the postman and the G-man and the forest service cannot be curtailed. The only people he would sever from the payrolls are the tax collectors.

That gets us down to a few other big items—totaling over four billion dollars to take care of four things—payments to agriculture, federal public works (including P. W. A., reclamation and flood control), work relief for the unemployed (including C. C. C.) and assistance for our old people.

My visitor agrees with me that we are going through a transitional period seeking the best way to maintain decent prices for the farm population of America, trying to make them better customers of business men—and that even if we have not yet found the permanent solution we have got away permanently from 5 cent cotton and 10 cent corn and 30 cent wheat.

I come to the public works item. He suggests that that can be cut 50 per cent. I happen to know that his community is working tooth and nail to get a grant for a much needed new high school or that his County suffered severe property losses from recent floods. I suggest that we will start economy right there and not give the grants, defer building the levee or the flood control dam for twenty or thirty years.

In every case I find what I suspected. His local Chamber of Commerce, his local newspapers are yelling their heads off to have those projects built with federal assistance. And I say to him—"Consistency, thy name is geography. You believe with the United States Chamber of Commerce that federal spending on public works should cease—except in your own home town."

The item of funds for work relief: there my visitor-customer makes a last stand. He wants that cut, and cut hard.

We agree that there are between three and four million American workers, who, with their families, need work or money to keep alive. I drive him to the inevitable admission that the only alternative is to put them on a dole.

That is where I make a stand.

I tell my visitor that never so long as I am President of the United States will I condemn millions of men and women

to the dry-rot of idleness on a dole; never condemn the business enterprise of the United States to the loss of millions of dollars worth of customer purchasing power; never take the terrific risk of what would happen to the social system of American democracy if we foisted on it an occasional basket of groceries instead of the chance to work.

I well know the difficulties and the costs of a work policy.

I do not have to be told that 5 per cent of the projects are of questionable value—I know it. Or that 5 per cent of the people on relief projects ought not to be on the rolls—I know that too. But when you think of nearly three million men and women scattered over all the forty-eight States and all of the thirty-one hundred counties in America, I am proud of the fact that 95 per cent of the projects are good, and that 95 per cent of the people are properly on the rolls. And I know that the American people cannot be fooled into believing that the few exceptions actually constitute the general practice.

My friend across the desk murmurs something about old age pensions. He is a bit half-hearted about this and he finally admits not only the need for dignified support of old age, given and accepted as a new American right, but he realizes that over a period of years this support will have to be extended rather than reduced. You and I and all Americans agree that we must work out this problem for our old people.

And so my visitor leaves convinced, in nine cases out of ten, that balancing the budget today, or even next year, is a pretty difficult if not an impossible job.

A few words about federal taxes:

They fall into three principal categories—consumer taxes, like the taxes on cigarettes and gasoline and liquor; personal taxes, like the personal income taxes and the inheritance taxes; and, finally, taxes on corporations. Together they yield nearly six billion dollars.

For good sound business reasons two things seem clear to me.

First, especially in view of the unbalanced budget, we ought not to raise less money from taxation than we are doing now.

Second, it would be bad for business to shift any further burden to consumer taxes. The proportion of consumer taxes to the total is plenty high enough as it is. Remember, as business men and as retailers, that any further taxes on consumers, like a sales tax, means that the consumers can buy fewer goods at your store.

Therefore, I want to leave the proportion between these three groups of taxes just where it is now.

That means that if we reduce so-called deterrent taxes on business corporations, we must find substitute taxes to lay on business corporations. That language is as plain as an old shoe. Let me give you an example of what I call making a mountain out of a mole hill. There is a hullabaloo for the repeal of the undistributed earnings tax. You would think that this was the principal deterrent to business today. Yet it is a simple fact that out of one billion one hundred million dollars paid to the Federal Government by corporations, less than twenty million dollars comes to the government from the undistributed earnings tax—less than 2 per cent of the total.

Let me proceed. I am wholly willing to have this twenty million dollar tax, less than 2 per cent of the total, wholly repealed on two simple conditions, which are based on principle.

The first is that this twenty million dollars shall be raised by some other form of tax against corporations and not against other groups of taxpayers—and that it shall be raised in such a way that it will be paid by the twenty-eight thousand bigger corporations, earning more than \$25,000 a year, and not by the one hundred and seventy-five thousand little corporations earning less than that sum.

The second condition is that in the repeal of this tax we shall not return to the old tax evasion loophole by which a small group of very rich people were able to leave their profits in closely held corporations, thus avoiding the full rates of

the higher brackets on their personal incomes. Patriotic people will not want to go back to that pernicious habit.

I have talked with you at some length about the radicals who have the hunch that we ought to go back to the conditions of 1929; about performing a major operation by amputating present functions of government; and about the efforts of some who would reduce corporation taxes and add to consumer taxes.

But I would not have you believe that the conservative attitude of this Administration plans as any permanent part of our American system an indefinite continuation of excess of out-go over cash receipts.

This week is dedicated by the opponents of the Administration to merchandising horror about the national debt. We are having a National Debt Week like a National Clean-Up and Paint-Up Week.

Let us talk about the debt in business men's terms.

In the first place, a nation's debt, like the deposit liability of a bank, must be considered in relation to its assets.

A large part of the government debt is offset by debts owed to the government—loans of many kinds made on a business basis by the R. F. C. and the Farm Credit Administration, for instance, and now being repaid on schedule. These assets are just as sound as the loans made by the bankers of the country.

Another portion of the debt is invested in federally-owned enterprises, like Boulder Dam, which will pay out, principal and interest, over a period of years.

A third part of the debt has been invested in works like flood control dams and levees, to save us from heavy future losses. They will pay for themselves in a very few years by eliminating annual property damage which each year has run into hundreds of millions—pay by the saving of taxable values which otherwise would have floated off down stream.

The next thing to remember about the debt is that government, like business men, is investing in order to create a higher volume of business income and, therefore, a bigger net yield

for government. National income will be greater tomorrow than it is today because government has had the courage to borrow idle capital and put idle labor to work.

The year before I took office, our national income was thirty-nine billions. In 1937 it got up to sixty-nine billions. In 1938 it went back to sixty-two billions. Today it is running at the rate of sixty-five billions. At eighty billions, the income from present taxes will be sufficient to meet expenditures on the present scale—and actually to reduce our relief appropriations.

Today with no danger of surplus of goods over-hanging the market—just because we have tried to keep consumer purchasing power up to production—the nation is in an excellent position to move forward into a period of greater production and greater employment.

And, when this week you see all the crocodile tears about the burden on our grandchildren to pay the government debt, remember this:

Our national debt after all is an internal debt owed not only *by* the nation but *to* the nation. If our children have to pay interest on it they will pay that interest to *themselves*. A reasonable internal debt will not impoverish our children.

But if we do not allow a democratic government to do the things which need to be done and hand down to our children a deteriorated nation, their legacy will be not a legacy of abundance or even a legacy of poverty amidst plenty, but a legacy of poverty amidst poverty.

Don't you agree that it is better to work unitedly to balance national income and national out-go at a lever where government can do the things that have to be done to preserve our people and our resources than to play the speculative hunch and withdraw government from lending and investment, from conserving property and from providing work for our capital and our people, in the hope that in some mysterious way a miracle will occur—a miracle which our only experience, under modern conditions has proved impossible?

I keep saying, "Do not lose sight of the forest because of the trees." Let us always distinguish principles and objectives from details and mechanics. You cannot expect this Administration to alter the principles and objectives for which we have struggled the last six years.

But if you approve of the purposes that lie behind our policies, but believe our operating methods can be improved, then your help and your counsel are welcome—doubly welcome in this Administration. That relates to the details of taxation, details of relief, the details of every administrative branch of the government.

If I have spoken to you seriously tonight, it is because I believe that you, too, are thinking of the well-being of every man, woman and child in our country—that you go along with me in every effort that I can make for the preservation of world peace and for the preservation of domestic peace—not merely an armed peace which foregoes war for the moment, but a peace that comes from a knowledge, both abroad and at home, that there will be no further acts of aggression on the part of nations, on the part of groups or on the part of individuals. You think, rightly, of profits in your own business—so does every other American—so do I. But we are not ruled by the thought of profits alone. More and more we seek the making of profits by processes that will not destroy our fellow men who are our neighbors.

That is one of the functions of your government. It seeks your cooperation in the extension of that ideal. It is open to your advice and your help—because it believes that its fundamental ideals and yours are the same.

That is why I came to you not in the spirit of criticism, not with a big stick, but with a simple plea for your assistance as American citizens in working out our common problems with good-will and with the maintenance of the ideals of peace.

TECHNOLOGICAL UNEMPLOYMENT AND RELIEF¹

JOSHUA BRYAN LEE

This debate was given in the United States Senate on January 26, 1939, as part of the general discussion concerning Roosevelt's asking in a special message on January 4th, from Congress \$875,000,000 as a supplementary appropriation for relief until the next fiscal year. The House had voted on January 13th to reduce the grant to \$725,000,000. Senator McKellar moved an amendment to restore the full amount. In spite of the eloquence of Lee and others in support of the Administration's request, a coalition of Republicans and anti-New Deal Democrats, on January 27th, by a vote of 47 to 46, rejected the motion.

Mr. President, in Oklahoma we have 33,726 persons who have been certified to the W. P. A. rolls as eligible who cannot secure employment. I assume that those 33,726 persons in Oklahoma have no buying power, because that is the prerequisite to being certified for the rolls. Far be it from me to say "I told you so"; but a year ago, I believe, I made the statement here that if Congress would grant us a formula that would guarantee a price of 20 cents a pound on the cotton which we consume in this country we could fold up most of the relief agencies in the deep South and in the cotton-raising area. Of course, that was not done. At the same time I made the statement that if it were not done we would come back here and ask for more appropriations this year to continue these people on relief. I also said, I believe, that I should be one of those asking for this appropriation. Therefore I rise now to speak in support of the amendment which is to be proposed by the Senator from Tennessee [MR. MCKELLAR].

MR. HATCH. Mr. President, I do not want to interrupt the Senator; probably he has the figures which I am about

¹ Congressional Record. 84 no 17 1144-7, January 26, 1939 Reprinted through the courtesy of Senator Lee.

to ask for; but the statement that there are in Oklahoma 33,000 persons certified as eligible and not having work arouses my curiosity as to the number who are actually employed in Oklahoma. Has the Senator those figures?

MR. LEE. Those actually employed are 65,093. The number of persons certified for relief and available for assignment is 98,819. The difference is 33,726—33,000 persons who have no buying power; 33,000 persons who cannot be customers of any store, of any shop, of any business or profession; 33,000 persons who no longer constitute the mass to whom the manufacturer must sell his goods.

There are two major causes of unemployment. One, we may say, is the result of science. Labor-saving inventions have displaced many workers. The Rust Brothers of Tennessee have invented a cotton-picker which, if and when perfected and placed on the market, will throw out of employment in round numbers 3,000,000 persons who depend upon cotton-picking for enough money to grubstake them through the year. Should we pass a law to prevent that labor-saving device from coming on the market? Should we by legislation attempt to prevent a mechanical cotton-picker from being placed on the market? Not if you ever had your back ache from picking cotton all day—labor which is the hardest drudgery that can be found. You would not vote against the introduction of a machine to prevent that; but that means 3,000,000 persons who will be displaced by one invention.

I am told that in the steel mills, even since this depression began, labor-saving machinery has been applied until there are blocks and blocks of mills which you may go through without seeing a man. The mills are mechanically operated. There has been a displacement of labor.

What is the answer? Should we attempt, as China might do, to roll back progress and say, "We cannot and shall not progress?" Or shall we welcome every labor-saving mechanical robot that lifts the load from the back of man? I am sure my colleagues agree with me that if we are to progress

in the world we should welcome and subsidize labor-saving inventions; but with the coming of these inventions we are presented with the problem of furnishing employment to those who have been displaced by the inventions.

We are making an effort in that direction. We offered the wage-hour law last year as a contributing means of solving this difficult problem by shortening the hours people may work; and, incidentally, the reports we get on that law are very good. That was an attempt to cut down the number of hours in order to distribute the labor among as many persons as possible.

We are in a scientific age. My grandfather used to tell me how he cut wheat with an old-time scythe and cradle. You can imagine how much wheat one man could cut in that fashion. Compare that with wheat harvesting in the West today, where a man hooks a mogul on a combine and pulls into a thousand-acre ocean of grain and cuts and threshes that grain in one operation and pours it in a grain bin to be hauled away. The next thing we know some fellow will invent a portable flour mill and hook it on behind that machine and grind up the wheat into flour, and then perhaps a portable bakery on behind that and cook the flour up into hot bread all in the same operation, and put on a plow behind and let it prepare the seedbed for the next year, and sow the next year's crop, all in the same operation. [Laughter.]

But seriously, one man on a farm today, with power machinery, can do the work of five men or twelve men, depending on how far back in history we go to make the comparison.

Electricity? By our laws we are propelling the progressive movement of science. We set up a T. V. A. to send electric currents vibrating out over steel-towered lines carrying electricity to light dark homes and to lift heavy loads. Everything today is being done by electricity. Why, they even have an electric polling machine in New York, where a candidate is elected and his opponent is electrocuted at the same time. [Laughter.]

A young woman called up her husband and said, "George, you had better come home." He said, "What is the matter, honey?" She said, "I don't know; I must have got the wires crossed, or the plugs mixed, or something. Our radio is all frosted over, and our refrigerator is giving a fireside talk." [Laughter]

So we are living in a scientific age. It is useless to blink at it. It is useless to go to sleep with the belief that the unemployment problem will solve itself. It will not. There is only one power that can solve it, and that is the Government itself; and that is why we have government.

We make another contribution to the solution of that problem which I do not wish to discuss now, in the form of old-age pensions and the Youth Administration, hoping to cut off unemployment at both ends, giving the old people something to live on and at the same time furnishing enough income to young people that they may spend their time in school, and cutting down the number of unemployed in that manner.

There is another major cause of unemployment and that is the concentration of wealth in the hands of a few, with the accompanying increase of poverty on the part of the many. The two things operate in inverse ratio. The richer the rich become, and the faster they become rich, the poorer the poor become, and the faster and more numerous they become poor. That is a natural tendency. It was here before we were.

In the Army we were paid on pay day. I remember that when we were paid off all of us privates had the same amount of money; but by midnight that night some of us were flat "busted," and some of the rest of the privates had their pockets full of money.

Tonight we could divide up equally all the money in the United States, and tomorrow night some persons would be rich and some of the rest of us would be broke. The second night the rich would be richer, and the poor would be poorer and more numerous. The third night the rich would be

richer and fewer, and the poor would be poorer and more numerous; and that would continue on and on.

Wealth constantly and continuously gravitates toward the hands of a few, as surely as the laws of gravity pull falling bodies toward the center of the earth. Unless some power is set up to offset that tendency, the inevitable result is crash and ruin.

It has happened with every nation which has followed the policy of *laissez faire*—let the government keep its hands off, and let dog eat dog, and let the devil take the hindmost. It has always followed that there has been upheaval and revolution, and out of the wreckage a few human souls have crawled back and started all over again. If we pursue the same policy, sooner or later the concentration of wealth in the hands of the few will bring that about.

Wealth? We have more wealth in the United States than has any other nation on the face of the globe. Why, we have so much gold that we dig it up in Colorado and bury it in Kentucky; and yet we split hairs over furnishing buying power to a few poor souls who cannot buy the necessities of life.

Wealth? We have it in this country, but it is spotted, and being spotted is a sign of disease. The circulation of money is as necessary for the well-being of the body politic as is the circulation of blood for the well-being of the physical body. When it congests in one spot, there is disease; and unless the congestion is broken up and circulation established, death will follow.

Money? We have it in this country, but it is spotted. We have, in round numbers, over \$50,000,000,000 of untaxed bonds that do not bear their share of the cost of government. When we realize that those \$50,000,000,000 of bonds are owned by those in the highest wealth brackets, we realize that the ones who buy the bonds are those most able to buy and store them away and therefore be exempt from paying taxes on them. We have enough wealth in America, we have enough natural resources in America, we have enough manpower in America to develop those resources. Have we

enough courage in this body to bring those things together in the proper relation to move forward, or shall we hesitate and talk about stopping the flow of money?

The concentration of wealth in the hands of the few brings stagnation. The Government must set up a power that is constant and forceful, bringing about a redistribution of wealth continually and constantly, or the wealth will all find itself in one place. That is the position in which we are today. It has been said the wealth of the nation is concentrated until one per cent of the families have 66 per cent of all the national wealth, while thousands of others, yes, millions, have so little that it is not enough to live on.

Today we are debating whether or not we will increase the amount appropriated for the W. P. A. pay rolls.

I realize that this administration has been called a Santa Claus. President Roosevelt has been called Santa Claus so much that he has discontinued the dairy business on his farm in Dutchess County, N. Y., and has gone into raising Christmas trees. I suppose he wants to raise enough so that he can hang up presents for everyone.

We are criticized on account of the W. P. A. Goodness knows I cannot defend every act of the W. P. A. everywhere, and I say frankly that I hope the time will come when we can taper off the W. P. A. into a permanent public-works program, where the employment will be through private contract, where people will be employed as a private contractor employs them, and return to the local communities the semi-charitable and charitable cases so that the communities can investigate and take care of them. But that stage has not yet been reached. Today we are still confronted by the necessity of deciding whether to take care of these people or not take care of them. We have not worked out a public-works program. I should like to see us embark on a program that would favor self-liquidating and semi-self-liquidating projects, such as the construction of toll bridges, perhaps toll canals, and highways, power projects, and any other that had a self-liquidating possibility or a semi-self-liquidat-

ing possibility as a permanent proposition. But we have not yet reached that point. We still must take care of those who are before us today.

This criticism comes, "You will bankrupt this nation; you will ruin us" Let me ask those who make that criticism, Does it make for any less money in the United States if we put some of it into circulation? When we raise money by taxation and spend it by giving jobs, does that result in any less wealth in the United States? It certainly does not. It increases the wealth in the country, as every economist will testify.

The amount of money and wealth in the country is determined not only by the volume of currency but by the turn-over of the dollar. When we set up Government force pumps and start forcing money out from Wall Street to Main Street we are clearing the arteries and the channels of stagnation and putting the money in circulation; and that money, as it is turned over and over, means more wealth in this country.

Mr. President, I was interested in the question asked the Senator from Florida [MR. PEPPER] by the Senator from Maryland [MR. TYDINGS]. The Senator from Maryland asked, Is it not the purpose to increase the food and raiment and shelter supply of this country? Then he asked, Does the construction of a city hall bring that about? I was surprised at the able and distinguished Senator from Maryland asking a question like that. The question today is not whether there is a sufficiency of food and raiment. That is not the question. That would have been the question in the days of barter, but we are not in those days now. Today we have a medium of exchange known as the dollar, and when the circulation of that medium of exchange is stopped, we can have surpluses which are burdensome, as we do have today. Yet, because the circulation of the medium of exchange is stopped, they cannot be handled. What good would it do to increase the production of wheat and cotton and wool when we already have surpluses?

Certainly the construction of a city hall increases the food and raiment supply of the people, because the workers on the building convert their time into dollars, and convert the dollars into food and raiment. There is a sufficiency in this country, and there is more than that.

I must tell a story here which I have told before, of an old fellow who had more whiskers on his face than I ever saw hanging on any man's chin. His head was as bald and as slick as an egg. I looked at him and said, "That is our situation today—overproduction and poor distribution." [Laughter.] I do not believe there would be overproduction in this country if it were not for the poor distribution.

Let us follow up that question of men working on the city hall. In the first place, the city hall is built of brick. Whence come the brick? From a clay deposit, and the clay has to be mined. Who does that mining? Laborers. What do those laborers get for their work? They get money. What do they do with that? They buy clothes and shoes and food. Then what is next? The next is cement. Someone has to mine that, haul it, and sack it. Then there is the paint. Someone has to produce the paint. There is the lumber. The lumberjacks in the forest get employment in producing the lumber, and they convert their labor into money, and that money into food and raiment and shelter.

What does the W. P. A. worker who toils in constructing this city hall do? Let us say he gets a dollar. What does he do with that dollar? Does he roll it up and smoke it like a cigarette? Certainly not. Does he roll it up in a wad and swallow it? Certainly not. Does he light a match and burn it? Certainly not. It is ridiculous even to ask such questions. What does he do with it? Does it mean less money in the country when that laborer gets the dollar? Certainly not. What does he do with it? He takes it to the grocery store as fast as he can and buys bacon and beans and other food supplies for his family, and, if any is left, buys clothing for his wife and children. It means unclogging the

channels of trade, so that the dollar can be converted into food and raiment and shelter. That is exactly what it means.

We might be able to get along without the city hall, it is true, but that W. P. A. worker and his family cannot get along without the money he gets for helping build that city hall.

We are told that an increase in the appropriation means more taxes. From what class do the taxes come? They come from those who have the money. We can get out of paying any taxes at all by bringing back the soup lines. Then we can get into them and stick our hands down into our empty pockets and console ourselves by reflecting that, though we are starving to death, we do not have to pay any taxes. Certainly there are people paying taxes today who did not pay them several years ago, and some of them are displeased at having to pay them.

Do taxing and spending mean less wealth in the United States? Certainly not. I do not mean that there is not a limit beyond which we should not go; but I think we have already gone further than the limit in one direction in allowing so many people to be without buying power.

Let me illustrate the point in this way: At my home we had a sandbox where the children used to play. There was a certain amount of sand in that box, and sometimes the children when playing would have the sand all heaped up in one corner of the box, sometimes they would have it all leveled out nice and smooth, but it was the same sand in the box. It did not make any less sand when it was all spread out.

Which makes for more prosperity in the United States, to have a hundred men with a million dollars each or a million men with a hundred dollars each? The answer is obvious. Bringing about a redistribution of purchasing power, by taxing those most able to pay and giving jobs to those least able to buy, makes for prosperity. That is the whole program, and that is what we are working on here, to bring about prosperity by taking money by income taxes,

inheritance taxes, gift taxes, corporation taxes, and the different forms of taxes which reach all wealth in proportion to its ability to pay and in proportion to benefits received, and giving jobs to those least able to buy and increasing their purchasing power.

It is not confidence the business people need today, it is cash customers, and we are trying to see that they get more cash customers

MR. LUNDEEN. Mr President, will the Senator yield?

MR. LEE. I yield.

MR. LUNDEEN. I take it, then, the able Senator would agree that the problem is not one of production, but is a problem of distribution.

MR. LEE. To a great extent it is one of distribution of the purchasing power, as well as of the commodities. If we distribute the purchasing power, the commodities will be distributed, because whenever there is purchaser demand on the one side and an ample supply on the other, there is a free play and flow, and full prosperity throughout the nation. What we are seeking is an increase in the purchaser's power up to the bare necessities of life alone. That is all we are asking, not for ability to buy any luxuries.

I was speaking of confidence in business. Confidence is as much a result as a cause of prosperity, in my opinion more. When does the businessman have confidence? After he has done a good day's business, after he has sold a good supply of goods, his confidence goes up. He says, "I feel better. I will buy more goods and fill my shelves." So that confidence is as much a result as it is a cause, and in my opinion more.

Confidence will rise in equal ratio with the increase of purchasing power of the people throughout the nation. I fully agree—in fact that is one of the things in which I am deeply interested—that we should increase the purchasing power of the 30,000,000 people on the farms throughout the nation, whose purchasing power has dropped to nil.

There are 6,000,000 farm families. Counting at least five persons to the family, that makes a total of 30,000,000 farm people. Their purchasing power has dropped to a very low point. The average farm family income in one of the states is \$75 a year. What kind of purchasing power is that? No wonder the channels clog up when the people do not have the money with which to purchase goods.

No business man ever refused goods to a cash customer simply because he was pouting at the Government. When we get the cash customers, we will have good times, and not until then. We hear many idealistic talks about confidence on the part of business. That is all very well, up to a certain point. But let us not blind our minds or confuse our reasoning.

FORWARD AMERICA: A DEBATE¹

T. V. SMITH AND ROBERT A. TAFT

This debate, the final, in a series of thirteen, was delivered over the Columbia Broadcasting System, on May 16, 1939. Taft and Smith were both newcomers in Congress, the former in the Senate, the latter in the House. Representative Smith, a professor of Government at Chicago University, and one of the Chicago Roundtable Broadcasting group, had been a state senator of Illinois, and had campaigned successfully for Congress on a New Deal ticket in 1938.

Taft, described as "quiet, shy, exclusive, dignified, and colorless as a speaker," in the Ohio Republican primaries of 1938 defeated seasoned campaigner, A. H. Day, by 62,000 votes, and then defeated Senator Bulkley by a hundred thousand.

The purpose of the Smith-Taft series was described by the CBS as "to give a practical demonstration of the effectiveness of the democratic method of government and way of life. They (Taft and Smith) will demonstrate that the democratic method of mutual criticism and controversy is, at its best, not destructive, but constructive." The general theme was "Foundations of Democracy." The series ran from February 21st to May 16th.

The American Institute of Public Opinion asked the auditors this question, "Which do you think had the better of the argument?" The survey showed that of those who indicated a preference, 66 per cent were for Taft, 34 per cent for Smith. One in three had no opinion. It was estimated that 5,000,000 persons heard one or more of the broadcasts.

REPRESENTATIVE SMITH

My fellow-countrymen: This marks the end of these friendly debates with my legislative colleague, Mr. Taft, junior United States Senator from Ohio. In spite of frank talk and hard blows from each of us—never personal, however, from either of us—I am happy to recall at the end our joint hope expressed at the beginning that we would raise partisanship a notch in the direction of patriotism.

¹ Congressional Record. 84, no 102-8621-4, May 24, 1939. By permission of the authors and by courtesy of and through special arrangement with the publishers of the debates, Alfred A. Knopf Co. The text of the Smith debate was supplied through Representative Smith.

Underneath our earnest differences we are both Americans, belonging to great parties both of which are American, and engaging in a type of sportsmanship that is truly and deeply American. I wish particularly to express my pleasure at having drawn an opponent in these debates who is both literate and articulate, who is both honest and courageous. All conservatives I willingly believe to be as honest as other men, but how few conservatives have, like Mr. Taft, the out-loud courage of their inner thoughts! It will be a safer day, politically speaking, when more conservatives out with it—as Mr. Taft has here done—on both our basic national institutions (the Constitution, the Executive, the Congress, the judiciary, and the states) and the major national problems now engaging attention (unemployment, security, war and peace, labor, agriculture, and the debt). I'd like, indeed, to register before my fellow-countrymen my appreciation of Mr. Taft and my admiration for his example. He's one of the very few conspicuous and ambitious conservatives who do not prefer silence to speech, one of the rarest of the rare who show themselves willing to go up or down with their own honest convictions boldly expressed before the country.

I salute the Columbia Broadcasting System for the courtesy of its network, and I thank the many of you who have written in and the millions of you who have not written in. I thank Mr. Taft again for helping me help him demonstrate that one of the foundations of democracy is to accept opposition as also a standard form of coöperation. I salute you, I salute him; but I warn you that he's trying to lead America backwards, whereas our concluding subject is "Forward America!"

I

But what is "forwards," what "backwards," for America? Let me remind you of some simple truths. We live in a highly organized world, and few of us like the way organizations cramp our individual style. Why, in many

cities even citizenship itself is hard to enjoy because of the bossism which encrusts it. Some of my friends who belong to labor unions have talked to me frankly at times about how little voice they have in their own unions. They feel squeezed by the very organizations they joined to protect their freedom.

What these labor union men tell me, Senator Taft says the farmers of Ohio have been telling him. The farmers have organized to aid themselves and now feel regimented, he says, by what you and I know to be the program of farm organizations. You remember the Senator in a previous debate hazarded the bold statement that his Ohio farmers resented so strongly what he called regimentation that they'd rather have no program at all than this one they've already worked out for themselves. Though many Illinois farmers tell me otherwise and though some of Senator Taft's Ohio farmers have written me protesting his statement, I dare say that in the event the farmers will find organizations as galling as do labor union members.

In this discontent at the loss of individuality, I believe that the farmer and the industrial laboring man are but typical of modern men in general. Listen for the same complaint from the retailers, meeting in Washington next week. Moreover, the rest of us see that the labor unions have grown so strong that they can, almost upon the order of a single man, arrest the flow of coal, or electric current, or even of milk for our children. We see that the farmer can now limit his acreage or reduce his marketing quota and thus hoist the prices we pay for what we eat or wear. We see and resent the social danger of such organized power. It touches us as consumers. But it touches the worker as producer and consumer and narrows his rights as a man.

This epidemic abroad in the world deserves a name. Let us call it Organization-itis. When it strikes, it limits our freedom and hurts our dignity as men and women. Echoing in advance one complaint of the retailers, it's chains

everywhere—not only chain stores but chain unions, chain farm federations, chain schools, and even chain churches. In our heart of hearts we all know that the spirit of the chain gang has broken out of prison and roams at large, making the whole world a sort of prison house for free spirits. A new feudalism is upon us, in which each of us becomes, as the old word was, a masterless man unless we join something and let our organization try to master other organizations with which we have to bargain for a living—and then, alas, end (our own organizations end) by mastering us. The universality of this feeling makes appropriate Lincoln Steffens's attribution of the secret of it to the devil—the secret that the way to ruin any and every good cause is *to tempt men to organize it*.

This feeling is so prevalent, not only in totalitarian lands but even in our own democratic country, that my unknown verse-maker has hardly exaggerated the homesickness that comes over the veneered pioneer in each of us when the romantic hour of springtime strikes in us the far from lost chord:

I want to be off to the edge of the world,
 Away from the realm of law,
 To the land where never a flag's unfurled,
 And the life is rough and raw.

I want to be off where the roads are new,
 Or there's never a road to see;
 For ever and ever the long years through
 The wilderness calls to me.

I play my part in the business scheme
 Of barter and trade and sale,
 But deep in my secret soul I dream
 Of the joys of the open trail.

I think of the pungent campfire swirled
 On the breath of the winds that blow,
 And I want to be off to the edge of the world—
 But I haven't the nerve to go!

II

I speak feelingly about this, and even quote poetry about it, because it hits me hard. It hits me hard as one born in a log-cabin where self-help was the only help; it hits me hard as a Democrat, who with his party distrusts organization; it hits me hard as an independent politician, who un-joined all organizations possible before standing for public office. Yet Mr. Taft has throughout these debates blamed my party for too much government, especially for what he calls regimentation of the farmer. I admit that we have enabled the farmers the better to organize. I have even tried to claim Democratic credit for making organized democracy work in the factories also, through the Wagner Act and the National Labor Board. Indeed, I remind you now that the major promise of the Democratic program of '32 was to try to equalize upward the bargaining and purchasing power of both agriculture and labor. But—I hear a voice from the northwest corner of conscience! Don't I know that Thomas Jefferson foresaw that when America got organized in cities and collectivized in spirit, America would become like Europe and individualism would be dead or dying? Yes, I know it; and I frankly admit that I'm sad about it.

What Mr. Taft ought to be sadder about, however, and isn't is this: Under Republican influence America was so *one-sidedly* organized by '32 that the old free competition called capitalism had actually become a financial feudalism. The Republican folklore of capitalism has entrenched itself behind a folklore of fatalism which made voluntary change impossible because it held change itself unnecessary. Weren't the right men secure? When the right men are secure, they worry little about the rights of men.

There's little doubt that these conservatives were, and are, honest in the aristocratic belief that a moral receivership is better than democracy for the American people. They hold honestly to the "seepage" theory of welfare. Make wise and good men—that is, themselves—secure at the top and whatever welfare is possible for the people will seep through.

They may be right about their own superiority. But no Democrat could believe it and still be democratic. Nevertheless, their organized strength was too great to be directly disbanded. Such drastic action would have required revolution in the depths of Republican depression. That was our predicament when it came our time to go forward for America in '33. Let me illustrate it with a story.

A countryman was asked by a tourist downstate how to get to the capital.

"Start here," said the countryman. "Go straight ahead for two miles, then turn left one mile, then right. . . . No, that won't do. . . . Let's come back and start over. . . . Beginning here go straight ahead two miles, as I said. Then don't turn left, but right for one mile . . . then left. No, that's not right either."

Thoughtfully he paused a puzzled moment and then looked up at the tourist to confess. "Say, Mister, if I wuz you and wanted to go to the capital, I'd not start here!"

That was, I repeat, exactly our predicament in '33. Revolutionists might have started some more romantic place than the hole where the Republicans left the country. But we Democrats had to start where we were. Communists would have started elsewhere by drumming up class hatred that did not exist in America, not even in the hardest times. Nazis would have found a scapegoat to conceal their taking over the financial power and then would have used the power against farmers, laborers, and the capitalists themselves. But we were Democrats who had to start where we were, with vast corporate interests over-organized against the American people. .

The Republicans see this evil of over-organization but see it only by halves. They really don't want labor to organize, nor the farmers either, though they bear such ills as best they may in hope of 1940 and beyond. But they do want the present corporate structure to remain and the predominant influence of business to continue (two hundred corporations, if not the sixty families, controlling America).

Their own self-interest organized as conscience prevents their clearly seeing that if finance and business are thus over-organized, workers must over-organize or suffer eclipse of their rights as human beings. And if both these sides of the industrial process are over-organized, farmers must over-organize. And if both great producers, industrial and agrarian, are thus over-organized to protect their interests, consumers must eventually over-organize to protect their rights. And so Organization-itis spreads from this single Republican source of group selfishness and rages throughout the body politic. We Democrats, not being revolutionists, have had to treat the disease homeopathically, *appearing to make it worse as the only peaceful means of making it better*. So much for the disease, its cause in corporate centralism, and its development arrested by the counter-claims of farmers and industrial workers.

III

What, now, about the future? And is there realistic ground for choosing one party rather than another to hold the disease in check and to go forward to a cure? Yes, there is ground for this choice, though the situation is chronic and confused. Ground for choice there is, however, and room for hope as long as the liberal spirit of the Democratic party endures, in whatever form. Contrary to prevailing pessimism, I'm convinced that it's not "later than we think," if we'll only think.

Neither party, of course, knows what to do about unemployment; and neither can balance the budget save by a prosperity which both will woo but which neither knows how to win. But the Democratic party will keep the nation balanced meantime by doing its duty to the unemployed gladly rather than glumly with Herbert Hoover. As regards social security for the employed, it's the Democratic party overwhelmingly; for we not only caused social security, but we believe in it. The Republican party does not believe in

it as an ideal—at least Mr. Taft has said that he doesn't—and so it tolerates social security as political expediency, flirting the while with wild and strange innuendoes of two hundred dollars a month dispensed according to the political rather than the financial calendar. All checks are equally good, you know, until you have to cash them.

As regards a more lasting remedy, moreover, for Organization-itis, the Republican party is clearly at a disadvantage. It cannot renounce its old allegiance to the corporate one-sided organization of life which it has fostered. Nor can it rob itself of the fruits of its corporate organizations by suffering agriculture and labor to become as strongly organized as it has organized industry. So the best we could hope through it would be a return to financial feudalism, labor and agriculture knuckling under to a dishonorable peace. That would involve such a loss of purchasing power as again to undercut the financial feudalism as in '29. That's the best to hope, however, from the Republican party, a chronically recurring spiral of disaster.

The worst to fear from it is that, agriculture and labor fighting back through the organization we've given them, the corporate power will again lay hold of the government as under Coolidge, roughly pushing labor toward serfdom and agriculture toward peasantry. Even if the so-called Grand Old Party then escapes the corruption of the old Ohio gang and the honest lethargy of Hoover, it will become a sort of Republican fascism. I here use the term not abusively but descriptively. Fascism arises, you know, from having all great interests organized and incorporated. Then the State finds it easy, if not indeed necessary, to become the *incorporation of the corporations*. Organizing thus the organizations, the State proceeds to work upon the many the will of the few incorporators, now turned conspirators. Mussolini, let us remember, more frankly than Republicans, calls his form of government the Corporate State. And any government that arises from strident competition among corporations is likely to become itself the corporate holding

company of all the other organizations incorporated under it. If that's the road ahead, let Republicans lead. They'll find it more natural.

If, with the Republicans at their worst, we are to move backwards to this corporate fascism, or, at their best, to an older feudalism of wealth, let us pray that our retreat be not in the winter time and that the speed be slow.

IV

I, for one, am convinced that the American people do not want that ending and so do not want to journey down that road. Indeed, we do not want to live in the shadow of such pressure groups as already make our politics closely akin to war, whether the group pressing be labor, agriculture, or business. The only road of safety is to keep these organized pressures equal and balanced against each other *until their fierce competition can be subdued together* into a more coöperative order. It's certainly not safe to let any one of them run away with the show, as Republicans have let the commercial interests. I refuse myself to believe that the middle way of practical democracy, already operative in small countries like Sweden, cannot be attained in this great republic, through our traditional spirit of equality and friendliness. Pending the return to coöperative individualism, the least modification of capitalism which the times permit is to equalize between these great organized bodies the competition which capitalism pre-supposes between natural individuals equal before the law.

But there's no way to maintain this modification or to return toward the coöperative democracy of competing individuals save through the machinery of representative government. Public power is the only possible antidote to private power. And I may add that public taxes are much better than the private taxes of prices controlled from behind the scenes.

Knowing all this, it is the genius of the Democratic party to accept, therefore, a paradox that terrifies honest

Republicans and enrages selfish Republicans. It is the paradox that *more government is required to get more freedom for the most people*. The only power we Democrats finally recognize is the power of the whole people, which is government. Today we have used that power to curb corporate power of business. Tomorrow we may have to curb corporate labor. And who knows that day after tomorrow we may not need it to curb farmers grown too fiercely strong through organization? This common power of democratic government is our only reliance against corporate greed, however organized and wherever found.

Let us be quite frank about it: to deal with economic monopolies in the modern world there is required monopoly of another sort. A monopoly of the legal force of the whole community used to be called democratic government. The Republicans would now have you think of it as "regimentation" so long as they do not control it. But it remains just what it is, democratic government, and the people's only reliance against corporate encroachment. I am not now speaking of "trust-busting," which has swelled many a political throat and has as yet "busted" very few "trusts." Yet Democrats have the patience to find out what needs doing before we sally forth to do it. Our present monopoly investigation is trying to find out what monopolies injure what help the country. This determined, we shall move resolutely in the direction here pointed. Nobody else will move any direction save backwards.

To break the old bottle-necks of control once they are located and then to prevent new bottle-necks from forming we are streamlining our Democratic government. I have in these debates thought it useful to give a new and unprovocative name to a government adequate for the tasks before us. This philosophy of government I have called the New Federalism. I call it Federalism because, like Alexander Hamilton, the great old Federalist, I believe that where government is required, it ought to be made efficient through coördination of powers long left inefficient by separation. I call it New

because, unlike Hamilton, I do not believe "the people beast, sir," but the source of all power and the only right beneficiaries of their own power efficiently organized representative government.

Such democratic centralism is giving us cheap elect power. This ought to enable us to decentralize indust That done, we may democratize finance by a generous pol of credit extension. Both these done, farming and lab could again become, as work should be, a way of life inste of, as now, an individual struggle for existence and an ganized competition against corporations for power and pla Democratic centralism of government thus points to a centralization of every privileged form of collective pov and promises a slow cure for the worst form of that soc disease, Organizationitis.

I say "slow" advisedly; for, as the White Queen remark to Alice, "Here, you see, it takes all the running you can do keep in the same place. If you want to get somewhere, y must run at least twice as fast as that."

Whether we shall actually move forwards in this Democratic direction toward individual freedom or backwards w Republicans to feudalism or fascism, it is for the peo themselves to say. As for me, I am grateful that tonight can still enjoy in humility the American way of friendlin and humor. Such a happy way of life enables a Smith look at a Taft and counsels a Taft to argue with a Smi Thus the American way unites in tolerance a mellowed tra tion and family pride, on the one side, with a joy in skill a a feel for the multitude, on the other.

Long may it remain so!

Now, as the Senator and I, contentedly alone, or happy together, stroll from this studio down the grassy Mall, w pass from Washington's lofty monument in sight of Lincoln majestic home, on down by the new shrine rising to Thor Jefferson. Beyond Jefferson's place, the river, which j keeps a-rolling along—this quiet Potomac, lazily coursing way to the sea since before Washington was—will beco

tonight for me a silver symbol of national unity across the gulf of years, softening the landscape of all present political differences. It is fitting that in "Ole Man Ribber's" presence we thus celebrate at the end of controversy our common devotion to a beloved fatherland: in our eyes its beauties of nature and in our souls the legacies of its great sons.

Triumphing over the palsy of fear felt elsewhere in the world tonight, the glory of such a nation as this we'll feel in the high beating of our common pulse of gratitude. And as our eyes wander from lights of city streets and sheen of river to the evening skies above, we'll commune for you all with a vast "universe not measured by our fears," until—as the great Justice Holmes further said— "after the sunset and above the electric lights there shine the stars."

SENATOR TAFT

Citizens of the United States of America: In this closing debate, I wish to thank Representative Smith for his kind words regarding myself, and even more for the spirit of tolerance and friendship which has governed our differences of opinion. It has been the greatest pleasure to debate with him, in spite of his steadfast opinion that I am always in the wrong. I admire his eloquence, and his wonderful command of the English language. If, with all his ability, he is unable to find a logical and consistent defense of the New Deal, certainly it is not his fault, but that of the New Deal itself.

Forward, America But which way is forward? Surely we have been going forward during the last 150 years toward a goal which the Pilgrims established in 1620, and which was carried on by the founders of our nation. That goal has increased individual freedom, with more material welfare to enjoy it. Surely we went forward in spite of this talk about financial feudalism. Men were more free in 1932, before the New Deal, than they were in any other country in the world. Their material welfare had steadily increased until the average workman had a standard of living three times

as high as it was in 1820. The average New Dealer seems to think that because 1933 represented the bottom of a financial depression, there was no democracy or prosperity in the United States before Franklin D. Roosevelt. Surely a majority of the people decided every four years what kind of a Government they wished, and surely the Congresses then, as now, voted the way they thought their constituents wanted them to vote.

It is the New Dealers who no longer wish to go forward along our well-marked path. They started along that path in 1933 for a few years, but they have wandered further and further into the forest of government regimentation until, in complete darkness they are moving back in the direction of the Middle Ages. It is quite true, as Representative Smith says, that they "have moved in both directions at once." Some of their measures have sincerely tried to make our system work; others threaten to destroy America as we have known it.

Unlike Representative Smith, many of the New Dealers have no concern whatever for individual freedom. They are collectivists, like Marx and Lenin and Mussolini. They believe in planned economy; that the government should regulate every detail of industrial and commercial and agricultural life. They are willing to sacrifice individual freedom in order supposedly to improve the condition of the poor and increase their material welfare. But in this purpose the policy has completely failed. There are more than 10,000,000 people unemployed today, and the largest relief expense this year, ten years after the depression, than any in the history of the United States. Farm prices are lower than they have been for six years. Businessmen are discouraged and indignant. Deposits have piled up in the banks because rich and poor alike are afraid to put their time or money into private enterprise, because they fear that government regulation will prevent success, and government taxation will take whatever profit there might be. The New Deal policy is the only one which has ever plunged us into a second de-

pression before we were out of the first. If any policy leads backward and not forward, it is the policy of spending billions of borrowed money, and piling up a tremendous debt for future generations to pay. A policy which inevitably leads to bankruptcy and inflation of the currency will not only make the poor people poorer, but it is likely to force a socialism which will utterly deprive them of individual freedom.

Representative Smith tonight states the philosophy which dictates this backward policy. He says, "The way to get less regimentation of our individual lives is to suffer more governmental regulation." He adds, "We have added political regulation to economic regimentation, and have made it stick." He admits that a continuation of this policy leads to the corporate state of Mussolini and his only suggestion for avoiding that goal is that we support the work of the monopoly committee, which is trying to find out whether monopolies exist. Think of it. The New Dealers, who know everything in the world about labor and securities and agriculture and every other man's business, excuse themselves from failure to prevent monopoly in industry because they have only had six years to find out about it. No, the New deal policy is leading us rapidly backward today, and it is a faint hope that its direction can be turned by any monopoly committee of Congress.

It is the Republican Party today which looks forward, and I am quite willing to accept Representative Smith's proposal that we start from 1932. Instead of throwing away all past experience and embarking on uncharted seas, we would keep the good things which the American system produced, encourage the principles which produced them, and correct the abuses which crept into it as they will creep into any system. Let us remember that conditions in the twenties in many ways were better than they ever have been since. Farm prices were more than twice what they are today. Unemployment practically did not exist. Men were eager to engage in new industries, expand old industries, and build

up both production and employment. If we had the same national per capita income today as we had then, we would have ninety instead of sixty-seven millions and if we had this 35 per cent more income than we actually have today, we could put most of the unemployed men back to work. We must restore conditions in which thousands of men and women every year were willing to invest their time and money in building up the United States and the prosperity of the people of the United States.

Representative Smith says that I "wish the many well through the assured welfare of the few." Of course, this is not true. No one has ever assured the welfare of any business enterprise until the New Dealers tried to do it under the N. R. A. It is said that two out of every three new businesses fail. It is not the assurance of success; it is the existence of conditions which make it likely that a man of exceptional ability or ingenuity, who is willing to work hard, shall have a chance to obtain exceptional rewards for himself or his family, a chance which shall not be destroyed by Government regulation and interference. This, says Representative Smith, is the "seepage theory of welfare." As a matter of fact, the men who are put to work in new jobs by new enterprises get their living and their purchasing power many months and often many years before the men who started the enterprises receive their reward, if they do receive it.

We have tried the alternative theory of producing prosperity based on dishing out Government funds to great classes of people, and while such action has been necessary it has certainly failed completely to produce general prosperity, and has not even restored those men who receive it to the material welfare they enjoyed in the twenties.

What were the abuses to be corrected in the system of the twenties? There were too many people rich beyond their deserts. I thoroughly approve of the New Deal measures to prevent fraud and sharp practice through the sale of securities, which was one of the principal methods of undeserved wealth. There were undoubtedly some monopolies whose

owners received profits greater than they deserved. I may say, however, that the monopolies before 1932 were nothing to the monopolies fostered and built up by the New Deal under the N. R. A. For a number of years the New Deal was dominated by the theory that all business should consist of Government-controlled monopolies. Undoubtedly the Government should keep competition free and open, so that men may not make profits which they do not deserve, but I feel that the existence of business monopoly has been exaggerated. In practically all of the articles which average people buy there exists today, and existed in 1928, the most intense competition, notably in foodstuffs and clothing and automobiles.

The Republican Party believes in a sincere effort to keep competition free and open to the end that prices may be lowered and undeserved profits reduced. I might add that more anti-trust suits were filed under my father's administration than under any Democratic administration since that day. If wealth has been gained fairly, we believe that it can be reduced and is being reduced by income and inheritance taxation, and that there still prevails largely in America the old tradition of the nineteenth century, "From shirt sleeves to shirt sleeves in three generations."

Another abuse of the system of the twenties was that the distribution of income was not sufficient for a decent living for the poorer groups. I might point out that this condition has always existed under every system, and certainly exists in Russia under communism today. To increase the condition of the poor has been the earnest desire of every public-spirited statesman in either party. The question is not one of purpose, the question is, What method will improve that condition? The Republican Party thoroughly approves of old-age pensions, unemployment insurance, relief when necessary, and subsidized housing, but all of these together have not improved the condition of the poor over what it was in the twenties. There are more underprivileged today than there were in the twenties. There are more people

wholly unemployed, and many more earning a bare subsistence on relief. If we could restore the economic and business activity of 1928, we could add \$23,000,000,000 to the national income, most of it to the relief classes. Relief and old-age pensions together do not add more than \$4,000,000,000 at a maximum.

Finally, in the twenties it is probable that the laboring groups and the farm groups were at a disadvantage in dealing with individual employers and individual buyers of farm products. The Wagner Act, to promote collective bargaining in the labor field, and the farm cooperative acts, to encourage collective bargaining on the part of the farmer, are sound measures, if properly administered, to see that oppression does not arise in the normal processes of bargaining and competition. But Representative Smith wholly fails to distinguish between measures designed to assist cooperative organization, and measures proposing that the Government regulate agriculture and labor and industry. He confuses self-organization with governmental bureaucratic organizations. It is no slight confusion. It is the difference between freedom and slavery.

In the Guffey Coal Act to regulate prices and wages in the coal industry; in the Wage Hour Act, except to the extent that it is a real minimum-wage law; in the agricultural acts, which practically fix the prices of agricultural products; in the administration of the Wagner Act, which goes far beyond the purpose of that act to tell employers how they shall run their business; in the power sought to make arbitrary changes in the value of the dollar and the currency to effect some individual's idea of what prices should be, we see being worked out a complete Government-controlled economy. In order to allow the farmer to organize it is not necessary for the Government to pay out \$850,000,000 in benefits or loan money on cotton and wheat in excess of the value of cotton and wheat. These measures, like the N. R. A. and the A. A. A., lead backward. If we ever get to the point where the Government fixes the price

of all basic commodities, we cannot stop short of complete regimentation. There is a fundamental distinction between measures intended to keep the course of competition and investment and individual incentive open, and those measures intended to direct the activities of the men who engage in that competition and industry. Above all, we have the entire Government regulation process stimulated by the theory that Government spending can produce prosperity, a theory utterly disproved by our actual experience and by every sound economic principle.

The New Dealers today no longer go forward along the path which this country pursued for 150 years. They admit it. They say that everything is changed; a new era has come, requiring new methods. I don't believe it. Americans are still American. They have the same basic ideals which they have had for hundreds of years. They are just as eager for individual freedom. They are just as anxious to be let alone by Government agents. They are just as anxious to run their own local affairs and their own schools. They don't like relief, and they know that a reasonable prosperity can do away with the necessity for relief. They know that thrift and ability and hard work ought to bring rewards today, as they did in the horse and buggy days, if it were not for Government interference. They know that only the Republican Party can avert the disaster which will inevitably result from deficit spending, arbitrary price-fixing, excessive taxation, and Government regulation of everything and everybody.

We have heard a good deal about the depression of 1933, and the terrific condition left by the Republicans. But the depression of 1933 existed throughout the entire world, while the depression of 1937 was a special American depression, created by New Deal policies. Even the depression of 1933 was not solely a Republican affair. The biography of Carter Glass, which has just appeared, makes it very clear indeed that the bank crisis of 1933 was largely produced by the course of Franklin D. Roosevelt between the day of

his election and the day of his inauguration. It is now perfectly clear that Roosevelt not only blocked the sound fiscal policies proposed by Hoover, but that he refused to correct the impression, which really had such a sound basis, that he was contemplating a devaluation of the dollar.

HOW CAN WE SOLVE THE RAILROAD PROBLEM?¹

JOSEPH B. EASTMAN

This argument was presented on Thursday evening, April 13, 1939, and was one of the regular Town Hall programs. The moderator of the program was George B. Denny, Jr. Other speakers were Senator Burton K. Wheeler, and Mr. John J. Pelley, President of the Association of American Railroads. Questions from the audience followed the three set speeches, each eight minutes in length.

"America's Town Hall of the Air" is now in its fourth season, in cooperation with the National Broadcasting Company, from the Town Hall, New York. The broadcasts have been held each Thursday evening from 9:30 to 10:30 E.S.T., from November to May, over the NBC Blue Network. Millions of listeners tune in each week and hundreds of discussion groups throughout the nation function under the direction of the *Town Hall* directors. See the Thompson-Nye debate in *Representative American Speeches, 1937-38*.

Moderator: Our next speaker has spent the past twenty-five years of his life as a student of transportation, particularly railroad transportation. Mr. Joseph B. Eastman was a member of the Interstate Commerce Commission for many years, was Federal Coördinator of Transportation, and is now a member of the Interstate Commerce Commission. I take pleasure in presenting Mr. Joseph B. Eastman at this time.

Mr. Eastman. As you have heard, the railroad industry is financially sick. A lot of the companies are bankrupt; almost none is paying dividends. They are employing about half the men they once did and spending far less money for materials, supplies, equipment, and construction. The problem is to cure this sickness, if it can be done.

What caused the sickness? The chief cause was the general business depression. It greatly decreased the freight and

¹ Bulletin of American Town Meeting of the Air 4, no 23:12-16, April 17, 1939. By permission of Mr. Eastman and by special arrangement with the *Town Hall, Inc.*

passengers to be hauled. Ranking next was the tremendous increase in competition from other kinds of carriers—particularly highway motor vehicles, but including steamships and barges, pipe lines, and airplanes. In the past twenty years or so this country has spent at least as much in developing these other forms of transportation as the entire railroad investment. This competition has not only deprived the railroads of much traffic but has forced wholesale reductions in their rates and fares. Railroad traffic has also been lessened by the spreading of industrial plants throughout the country for the very purpose of decreasing the transportation required for inbound raw materials and outbound finished products; by the substitution of oil, gas, and hydroelectricity for coal; and by the decline in our exports and imports.

These things hurt railroad earnings very sorely. The financial consequences were aggravated by the fact that the railroads in the past borrowed much of their capital, and hence were heavily in debt. As earnings fell, they could suspend dividends on stock but not interest on bonds or notes. The result was that many went into bankruptcy and that many others cut expenditures to the bone and beyond healthy limits to keep out.

Can a sickness so produced be cured? Not in the sense that the railroads can be restored to their former position in the transportation world. Not all the king's horses nor all the king's men can undo what science and invention and the expenditure of billions of public and private funds have brought about. But if railroad managements, employees, investors, and patrons and the Government will coöperate, conditions can, I believe, be improved and processes set in motion which should produce—not quickly but ultimately—a transformed and healthy railroad industry.

For the moment the railroad managements have got in bed with railroad labor, probably because they know that labor now has much more political power than they have. Both allege that the railroads suffer from unfair competition, the idea being that their competitors have in effect been sub-

sided by the construction of highways and waterways at public expense. They jointly offer taxation and tolls for their competitors as the remedy, and they urge equal and impartial regulation of all types of carriers as a further curb on unfair and destructive competition. In principle I agree with them, but I think that they exaggerate both the facts and the relief which may be expected from this source.

By all means let us do what ought to be done along these lines, making sure of all the facts and that we do not treat any of the types of carriers unfairly, for the country needs them all. But it would be wholly wrong to conclude that the only way to improve railroad conditions is to make it harder for their competitors to do business. It is more important, in my judgment, for the railroads to do everything possible—and the possibilities are great—to give the public the kind of service it wants at prices which it is able and willing to pay.

In the past the railroad managements so glued their eyes on higher rates as the way to make more money that they failed to see how fast their competitive foes were advancing and to make changes in equipment, service, and prices, which might have gone far to forestall the competition. The employees were equally blind to changing conditions, and spent more time in trying artificially to make two jobs grow where one was enough than in adjusting their policies to the new necessities, with the result that in due time they often lost the one job.

Of late the railroads have shown new enterprise and have done quite a little to regain lost ground, but there is plenty of opportunity left. Many improvements are possible in equipment, in methods of operation and character of service rendered, in the adjustment of rates and charges to modern conditions, and, as Senator Wheeler said, in financial and fiscal practices. There are many unnecessary and wasteful railroad operations which are caused by the large number of separate and independent companies and which can be avoided through coöperation or consolidations. There are

many situations where trucks or buses, and perhaps other kinds of carriers, can be substituted to advantage by the railroads for rail operations, because they can do a better job.

To some of these changes the managements are lukewarm, chiefly because of the fear that the benefits will go to rival roads. To some labor is openly hostile, because it fears loss of employment. I can understand and sympathize with such fear and yet I believe that those who encourage the employees in it are not their true friends. The railroads are too hard-pressed to be able to afford the slightest extravagance. They have lost and are losing ground, and, if they are to reverse the trend, they must have all the benefits that maximum efficiency and enterprise can produce.

Investors in railroad securities have suffered severely, but they must, and I think do, realize that many of the railroad financial structures are top-heavy with debt, and that reorganizations are inevitable and essential to any future credit.

The Government can aid, not only in the ways which railroad managements and labor have suggested, but by assuming active leadership in planning and promoting the changes, both in the railroad industry and in the entire transportation industry, which are necessary to bring order out of chaos and produce conditions of sound transportation health. It is a situation which calls for eternal vigilance on the part of all concerned, because conditions are changing all the time, and the pace of the change is continually accelerating. In the end we shall think less, I feel sure, about railroads or trucks or any type of carrier, and much more about a smoothly running transportation system which will utilize all of these kinds of transportation in combination and coöperation according to their special merits.

AGRICULTURE, INDUSTRY, AND LABOR ¹

SIDNEY HILLMAN

This address was delivered on Saturday evening, February 18, 1939, at a dinner session of the Third Annual National Farm Institute at Des Moines, Iowa, at the Fort Des Moines Hotel.

This Institute, organized in 1937, was sponsored by the Agricultural Department of the Des Moines, Iowa, Chamber of Commerce. Appearing on the two-day program, were Chester Davis, member of the Federal Reserve Board, Frances Perkins, Secretary of Labor, Joseph R. Eastman, Interstate Commerce Commissioner, and Governor George A. Wilson of Iowa. The chairman of this evening session was W. W. Waymack, vice-president, *Des Moines Register and Tribune*. On this program was also Governor Wilson of Iowa, Charles R. Hook, chairman of the board of the National Association of Manufacturers, and Henry A. Wallace, Secretary of Agriculture. The general theme of the program was "Agriculture, Industry, and Labor." The purpose of the conference was to bring together farmers, industrialists, and labor for discussion of their common interests. The technique was "first the presentation and then free discussion of subjects calculated to bring issues out where light and intelligence, rather than heat and prejudice may be upon them. . . . No consensus of opinion is sought, save as free discussion may tend to lead to it. . . . The Institute is fundamentally a forum, organized for the spread of education and the encouragement of understanding. It is politically impartial."

Mr. Waymack, in introducing Mr. Hillman, said, "In the discussions of our Program Committee here locally, among the two or three names that bobbed up from the beginning, was always that of Sidney Hillman. We sought advice elsewhere, and again and again the suggestion came in any list of two or three names of men of that broad vision and statesmanlike quality. It came from labor men, employers, and various other individuals. Sidney Hillman's name always appeared. Let me quote from a letter from an attorney with reference to Sidney Hillman, a lawyer who represents large business interests. Here is what he wrote: 'He persuades instead of drives, both as to labor and as to employers. Many times he has averted strikes by direct personal contact with employers, often using mutual friends to get contacts. He recognizes the community of interest between employees and employers, each to develop it along

¹ Proceedings of the Third Annual National Farm Institute, Des Moines, Iowa, 1939, p. 117-24. By permission of the author.

mutually advantageous lines, vigorously, but as one who believes in the use of reason, and finally he sees beyond higher wages and shorter hours—he wants to build the conditions upon which the result is predicated.’

“I present to you now, Sidney Hillman, a statesman of labor.”

I consider it a rare privilege to be accorded this opportunity of participating in the deliberations of the National Farm Institute. In addressing itself to the subject which it has chosen for discussion this year, the Institute is performing a service which is basic to any constructive solution of the problems of our contemporary life. It has long been my deepest conviction that America will move forward along the path of progress only when a common agreement on fundamental objectives is reached by the three predominant groups in our national life: Agriculture, Labor and Industry. Such an agreement is possible only after the most full and frank exchange of views, in the course of which their common interests may be explored and their apparent points of conflict subjected to the type of searching analysis which alone can resolve them.

Never has the moment been more auspicious, never has the need been more urgent for such a task.

Today in 1939, after ten years of alternating crisis, depression and hard won and precarious partial recovery, we still face the problem of providing the people of America with purchasing power sufficient to buy the products which our economic system is geared to produce. Since 1929 we have lost the staggering total of 132 billion dollars of national income—one and a half times the value of all the goods and services which we produced in 1929.

This drastic decline in the national income has effected every group in the country. I don't need to tell you how it affected the farmers. Farmers, in 1938, had four billion dollars less to spend than they did in 1929, a year when agriculture had already faced almost a decade of depression, and eight billion dollars less than in 1919.

I want to be frank with you about it; I like to see our farmers do well, for I know whenever the normal purchasing

power of the farmers is reached normal employment will be reached in these cities and places that men and women are employed in—factories, plants, and general production.

Workers in 1938 received 12 billion dollars less in wages and salaries than they did in 1929. The contraction in the buying power of these two dominant groups in our national life in turn spelled decreased returns for the remaining groups who are engaged in selling them goods and services—business men, large and small, professional people and investors.

Lack of purchasing power has brought with it the paradox of idle men and idle wealth. Farm surpluses pile up; industry operates at only two-thirds of capacity; 12 million unemployed tramp the streets in search of jobs, and over 20 million Americans depend upon some form of public relief to keep themselves alive. Government expenditures partially compensate for the failure of private enterprise, but only at the cost of mounting deficits which cannot be indefinitely continued.

Can we today find the means to put our idle men to work at idle machines; increase the national income to a point which will permit us to consume the products of our soil; give full employment to our productive resources, and provide workers in farms and factories with what we once so proudly identified as the American standard of living? This is the urgent common problem which confronts Americans of all groups and interests.

It is a problem which we must solve not alone to alleviate human want and suffering, but under pain of destroying the very basis of our democratic institutions. In other nations, faced with an identical problem, competing groups proved unable to resolve their conflicts and agree and act upon a common program which would assure work and bread for all. It was their failure which betrayed the hungry and disillusioned people to the ruthless rule of the dictators who have drowned their protests in blood and set the wheels of industry moving, not to satisfy their wants but to arm

for a new world war. Today the dictatorships arrogantly challenge us to solve our problem without abandoning our heritage of freedom and democracy. At this critical hour, we in America must accept that challenge and demonstrate to the world and to history that democracy can and will survive because it can and will satisfy the needs and aspirations of the people.

No intelligent approach to our problem can be blind to the difficulties which it presents. The fundamental changes in national and world economy which have become evident since 1929 preclude the possibility of any "automatic" economic recovery of the kind which we witnessed after each cyclical depression in the past. Today recovery can be won only by the concerted effort of industry, agriculture and labor.

In the era of our expanding economy, inaugurated with the founding of the first colonies and continuing with only momentary interruption until 1929, we could afford the waste and inefficiency and even the injustices which resulted from the pursuit by each of these three great groups of its own self-interest with small regard for the interests of what each regarded as a competing group. The great task of peopling and building a continent gave full employment to all of our natural, industrial and human resources. It created an ever-mounting demand for the products of farm and factory and produced a continuous rise in the national income from less than one hundred million dollars in the late eighteenth century to eighty-three billion dollars in 1929. Although there were glaring inequities in the distribution of that income, nevertheless, the period of expansion was accompanied by a steady growth in per capita income which held out to each citizen the promise of almost unlimited improvement in his living standards.

The new national and world situation which was ushered in by the debacle of 1929 was not a sudden or fortuitous development. The problems of the post-1929 world are deeply rooted in the past. The disappearance of the frontier at the turn of the century spelled the end of our territorial ex-

pansion. The decline in the rate of population growth because of a decreased birth rate and the dwindling of mass immigration from Europe set limits both to the growth of our labor supply and to the demand for the products of farm and factory. But the consequences of these two basic changes in our national economy were obscured for many years because the field for the intensive development of the country remained almost untapped. The creation of a highly industrialized nation set us to building great cities, linking them with networks of roads and rails and exploiting our resources of fuel and power. These tasks continued to absorb all of our productive energies. They had scarcely been completed when the World War came.

The war and its aftermath further delayed the full realization of the consequences of the change in our national economy. For fifteen years America supplied the world with goods, redeeming the foreign loans which had financed her own industrial expansion and then becoming the creditor of the war-impooverished nations of Europe. Swollen war profits were reinvested in new productive enterprises and the rationalization of industry skyrocketed production to unprecedented heights. Agricultural production multiplied in response to what appeared an insatiable world demand for the product of American farms.

But despite artificial stimulation in the form of over-expanded foreign credits and an increasing volume of installment sales at home, there were already portents in the early and middle twenties that all was not well with the national economy. With the cessation of the extraordinary wartime demand for our farm products, agricultural income declined, never to recover. From 16 billion dollars in 1919, it slumped to nine billion in 1921 and even during the "prosperous" twenties never rose above 11 billion. The farmers' share in the national income declined ever more drastically from 18 per cent in 1919 and 15 per cent in 1920 to 9 per cent in 1928.

Labor likewise shared but meagerly in the fruits of our post-war industrial expansion of the twenties. While from

1923 to 1929 industrial output increased by 29 per cent, real wages advanced by only $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. Thus, our national economy failed to distribute to the two great customers of industry the purchasing power necessary to buy back the product of its expanded plant.

Foreign trade continued to compensate in part for this deficiency in domestic purchasing power, so that the national income continued to increase and most industries to prosper during the post-war decade. However, neither our industrial plant nor our manpower was fully utilized even during the days of our most vaunted prosperity. Unemployment never fell below one and a half million, basic industries, operated far below capacity and there were exceptions to the general industrial picture which felt the icy hand of depression long before the black October days.

When in 1929 the inevitable end came to the foreign lending upon which our industrial activity was based, the whole structure began to crumble. The stock market collapse which followed soon after wrote "finis" to the era of our expanding economy.

Today, we face the fact that the forces which in the past stimulated our industrial expansion no longer play a role. Our frontier is gone; our population is levelling off; our cities have been established, and even were a new industry like the automobile to appear today, it is doubtful whether it would be capable of infusing the needed blood into our circulatory system. Nor can we look abroad for salvation. The world frontier, like the national frontier, has disappeared. The failure of purchasing power abroad and the erection of artificial barriers which bar world doors to American trade have contracted the foreign market beyond any immediate hope of restoration to a point which can absorb our idle plant capacity and agricultural surpluses.

If we would be realists, we must look for our market at home. It is at home that we will find it. Our idle plants, our agricultural surpluses, our army of unemployed are not symptoms of a satiated demand for the products of our farms and factories. We have a vast and untapped domestic market

pable of absorbing all that our agricultural and industrial
ants can produce. You are familiar, I am sure, with the
epartment of Agriculture estimates that to provide even an
adequate diet for our population would require a 40 per cent
increase in farm production. This would mean sowing 32
er cent more acres of corn, increasing our cow herds by 68
er cent and the number of our hogs by 69 per cent and
aking similar increases in the production of other farm
roducts.

Dietary deficiencies are equalled by the need for clothes
and housing. Even in 1929, we were manufacturing only
two-thirds of a suit for every adult male member of our
opulation. And it has been estimated that if the wage
arning and farm families of the country had the means to
urchase the amount of cotton goods necessary to insure
their health and an adequate social adjustment, we would
increase the domestic consumption of raw cotton by 25 per
cent above the 1929 level. To rehouse the third of the nation
who dwell in firetrap city tenements and rural slums would
require the construction of some four million housing units
and an investment of sixteen billion dollars.

To make this unsatisfied demand for food, clothing and
helter effective is, for our generation, a task as challenging
as the conquest of the western wilderness was for our for-
ears. The reward for meeting that challenge will be richly
aid in terms of banishing immediate human misery, stabiliz-
ing our national economy and establishing our economic and
olitical democracy on an indestructible foundation.

This challenge can only be met if we find the way to
ncrease our national income and distribute it among those
groups who are today without the means to satisfy their
emand for the rudiments of a decent living. American in-
dustry and agriculture cannot find health in a market which
s limited to the 2.7 per cent of American families who have
ncomes over \$5,000 a year, or the 13 per cent who have in-
omes over \$2,500, or even to the one-half whose incomes are
bove \$1,250. If we would solve the paradox of starvation

in the midst of plenty, we must find the way to increase the purchasing power of that half of our population, in cities and on farms, who are receiving incomes of less than \$1,250 a year. Dr. Lubin, the Commissioner of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, has recently given us an indication of what we might expect from the success of such an effort. If the incomes of families earning less than \$1,250 a year were increased by only \$2 25 a day, their increased annual purchases would be something like this. 800 million dollars more for food; 416 million dollars more for clothing; 613 million dollars more for rent; 213 million dollars more for fuel; 385 million dollars for transportation; 234 million dollars more for recreation, and 208 million dollars more for medical care. These estimates furnish a convincing demonstration of the stimulus to our whole economic system which can come from making the potential demand of the low income groups economically articulate.

I think that there will be little disagreement on the necessity of increasing the purchasing power of the low income groups as a necessary condition for the restoration of a healthy economy. Industry, agriculture and labor all recognize in principle that this result can be accomplished only by according to each group its equitable share in the national income by restoring and maintaining a proper balance between farm prices, wages and profits.

Yet, in day to day living, this agreement in principle often yields to mutual distrust, jealousy and suspicion. City workers sometimes protest increased food prices that eat into their pay envelopes, failing to recognize that if this increase is passed back to the farmer, it will pay him returns in increased employment and better wages. Short-sighted farmers view with distrust the organization of workers to secure wage increases, and have sometimes even lent themselves to efforts to block the achievement of this objective. They see in wage increases only higher prices for the goods that they buy forgetting that between 27 and 43 cents out of every dollar won by the worker will be spent on food which the farmers pro-

duce. Industry, in search of larger profits, often attempts to drive down farm prices and hold wages at low levels, ignoring the fact that it cannot prosper by starving its customers

Yet no member of any of these groups who pauses to note the parallel lines which chart farm income, factory payrolls and profits can fail to conclude that the fate of all is intertwined with the fate of each. Truly, all three must hang together or all three will hang separately. The growing recognition of that fact is one of the most hopeful signs in the present situation.

My own conviction that the problems of our national economy can find a constructive solution through cooperative action by the three great groups in our national life, is not based upon any utopian fantasy. It is born of thirty years of practical experience with the processes of collective bargaining. The clothing industry with which my life has been associated presents many problems of a type not unfamiliar to farmers. It consists a large number of small, mobile and highly competitive units. It is plagued with wide variations of consumer demand, with seasonal peaks and valleys and extreme sensitivity to fashion change.

Collective bargaining in the clothing industry stands as a record where both employer and employee have managed to cooperate together. We are closer to you farmers than any other. Our wages and prices go down so low that there is no problem of maintaining a monopoly, and let me say again without finding fault with some of our economists, it is true that you can find monopolistic industries that have maintained their price levels all through the depression, that have even raised prices, as Dr. Henderson has pointed out, in the last year or so, but the major part of industry is not in a position to control it—not that we wouldn't like to—we just can't do it. The same thing with you gentlemen. We are a competitive industry, and of course when prices go down we try to produce more and then, of course, we go into bankruptcy.

Your farms—no one wants to take them away from you these days. There are no people to take over foreclosed mortgages, our plants are just closed up. In 1910 when the first efforts were made to organize the industry, it was notorious as one of the most sweated in the country. Hours were as long as seventy a week and wages were near the bottom of the industrial scale, and they were not buying much of the farmer's products. From the point of view of management, the industry was in a chaotic condition. Cut-throat competition, waste and inefficiency were rampant, all made possible because there were no limits to which the workers might be driven and exploited.

Labor and management appeared to have irreconcilably conflicting interests which led to periodic outbursts in the form of bitterly contested strikes and lockouts.

The first effort to bring order out of this chaos was taken in 1911 with the execution of a collective bargaining agreement between the union and Hart, Schaffner and Marx which created the machinery for democratic government through continuous arbitration. That agreement has been continued, substantially unchanged, for thirty years during which there has been no interruption by strike or lockout of the harmonious relations between the company and its workers. The principle of this first agreement has now been extended to embrace ninety-five per cent of the entire clothing industry. If there is a fight, then it becomes national news, but if the whole industry is working without interruption of work, of course it is no news, gets no public attention.

Gains to the workers as a result of this process are registered in terms of shorter hours, higher wages, better working conditions, and increased job security. Hours have been reduced from seventy to thirty-six and I know how it will affect some of you people in this room, and wages increased almost fourfold until today men's clothing is numbered among the better paying industries of the country. These gains were not made at the expense of management. On the contrary, the standardization of wage rates, hours and quality

of workmanship and the joint efforts of management and labor to eliminate waste and promote efficiency in the processes of production have brought stability to the industry. I am confident that if today, after something over twenty years of cooperative effort, employers in the clothing industry were given an opportunity to return to the open shop conditions of the past, they would unhesitatingly reject it.

The success of this experiment in industrial democracy resulted from the opportunity which it gave to each party to understand and appreciate the needs and problems of the other, and their final recognition of the fact that the continued prosperity of each can be won only by assuring the well-being of both. The industry has learned that a fair share of its profits must be distributed to its workers if it is to be assured maximum efficiency of production and a market for its products.

Labor, on its part, has learned that its rewards depend upon the prosperity of the industry. It has recognized that irresponsible or extravagant demands which are beyond the capacity of industry to meet will only spell disaster to both partners in the enterprise. Accordingly, it has voluntarily accepted temporary wage reductions when an immediate emergency required. Further, it has rejected the short-sighted policy of attempting to stem technological advances and the installation of improved methods of work. Asking only that technological changes be installed in a manner which will work a minimum of hardship during the process of adjustment and that a reasonable share of any increased productivity be passed on to the workers, it has given its unstinted co-operation in increasing the efficiency of production.

As a result, the benefits which management and labor have realized from collective action have not been won at the expense of the consumer. Gentlemen, in 36 hours' work a week we turned out more than double per person per day than we have in a quarter of a century ago with from 54 to 60 hours a week, and, of course, it has meant reduction of labor costs.

Despite the rise in wages which has greatly augmented the purchasing power of the workers, the labor cost per garment has been increased but little. Consumers have reaped their share of the benefits of technological changes, the elimination of wasteful methods of production and the stabilization of the industry.

We had a conference—still twelve million people unemployed and the purchasing power is still low. We all say we want to cooperate. I believe an opportunity should be given to the leadership of the three groups—agriculture, industry, and labor—to come together and show what they can do. If labor is obstructive, I am willing that the light shall be directed upon it and labor made to cooperate. We all must cooperate, and, therefore, may I throw out the suggestion that I believe the time is ripe for a conference of these groups. The success of the National Farm Institute has demonstrated how fruitful such a conference might be.

I am fully aware that the problems of our whole economic fabric far transcend those of any particular industry. At the same time, I am convinced that the pattern which has proved so successful in the industry with which I have been associated holds the key to the solution of the greater problem. Assembled around the conference table, dealing with daily and long term problems as collaborators rather than as disputants, many of the differences which first seem irreconcilable appear as but two aspects of a common problem which is susceptible of solution to the mutual advantage of all parties.

The first requisite for any such cooperative effect is the establishment of strong, responsible and independent organizations of workers and farmers. Although both labor and agriculture, because of their long and often bitter struggles against great aggregates of capital, have traditionally looked with suspicion upon the organization of special interests in American life. I think it is clear that the processes of economic democracy require cooperative action by responsible representatives of well organized groups. Let us

take just a few moments to refer to some of the discussion I heard here this morning. I am sure that the opinions expressed were in the best kind of faith, but I am afraid of a lack of information on what is actually taking place in industry. I have heard explained that our trouble is with these inflexible union rates. Now I have no quarrel with my friends in the American Federation of Labor. I am hoping that the time will soon arrive when again there will be a united labor movement in this country. Don't forget that up to 1929 the total of organized labor out of industry and services was something a little less than 12 per cent. How could 12 per cent of the workers affect so disastrously the whole country? But let's take our industry, an industry organized in men's clothing fully over 95 per cent of what we had in the years 1931 and '32, and there was not much government interference, and taxes I suppose were rather low. We have contributed, and it is a matter of record, through voluntary negotiations from 50 per cent and over reduction in our rates to help those employers. Now I make good my statement that at least 50 per cent—and it is an industry working piecework—the union cooperating to put in piecework so that people get paid for what they do—and what happened? In 1930 the employers came and showed us their losses so we gave them a 10 or 12 per cent reduction. They had larger losses in 1931 and we gave a larger reduction, and we gave some of them as high as 25 per cent in 1933 because it was just to make sure that they could last until the new administration took office, and the loss for that year was greater until this government interference appeared and employment increased and they went out of red into black. Gentlemen, these are matters of record.

I believe if we want to make a contribution to our contemporary problems facing us, let us discuss frankly, honestly and sincerely what the problems are, and even when we know, it is pretty hard to come to the proper solution. I believe if in an industry like the clothing industry we

could get management and labor to cooperate, and, ladies and gentlemen, whatever is said about our organization in a complimentary manner I can testify to, the great majority of employers in our industry have tried at all times to do the right thing if they could only afford to do it; now if they could get this cooperation, why not try this active, positive cooperation on a national scale?

It is for this reason that labor has welcomed the growth of farm organizations in this country. It is for this reason that it has perfected its own independent organizations. I stress the need that these groups be independent. For neither labor nor farmers will long consent to act as the catspaw for some interest other than their own. Labor has emphatically rejected the company union and is resolved to drive it from industrial life. I am confident that farmers equally reject "company" farm organizations dominated by non-farmers in an attempt to deepen the conflict between farmers and workers and prevent them from uniting on a common program. Gentlemen, it will be the greatest tragedy for farmers and labor and the country if we are going to get distrust and division between these groups who ought to cooperate for the common good.

No program for the reconstruction of our national economic life can succeed today without the assistance of government. There are still those die-hards among us who continued to mouth the old shibboleth that business will revive very well by itself if only government stops interfering. Others give lip service to the objectives of the New Deal program but bitterly attack every concrete measure to extend or even to maintain it.

For most of us, however, the memory of the years that lay between 1929 and 1933 is still too green to countenance any retreat. For we recall that it was only the effort of government in 1933 to restore the national credit, give immediate relief against starvation, and how well I remember the bread lines in the richest city in the world—New

York City—in '31, '32, '33 and '34. Thank God we are spared of this degrading spectacle that confronted America in those years. Raise farm purchasing power and lay the basis for a more equitable distribution of the national income that pulled us up short at the very edge of the abyss. Nor have we forgotten that in 1937 the premature withdrawal of public funds from government construction and relief sent the business spiral into another tail-spin. It was only the resumption of public spending coupled with the fact that the government farm program and the growth of a strong labor movement were able to maintain some semblance of stability to the income of workers and farmers that prevented 1938 from becoming another 1932.

These lessons have taught us that the government must continue to supply more and not less purchasing power to the national economy until such time as private enterprise has demonstrated its ability to take up the slack.

Now, gentlemen, we are all agreeing on generalities, and I believe you really do. I am hopeful; I am an optimist; I have seen the change in the thinking of leadership and the rank and file of Americans in every part of endeavor. I believe that we are more ready today to face facts instead of hiding behind prejudices.

If an increasing national income is to generate the purchasing power necessary to revive our economy, it must be equitably apportioned among all groups in our population. To assure this result, the intervention of government may again be necessary. Labor has long recognized the special claim of the farmer to this kind of protection and has consistently supported legislation proposed by the farmers themselves to assure them a fair share of the national income. Minimum wage and hour legislation, which has now won almost universal acceptance, is designed to perform a similar function for the underprivileged industrial worker.

On the other hand, legislative measures may be needed to prevent abuses of power by any group which threatens

to absorb more than its fair share of the national income. Restraints may be required to prevent monopoly from taking unfair advantage of its strategic position to skim the cream from a recovery movement by exacting exorbitant prices and reaping exorbitant profits. Labor believes that our experience since 1890 has demonstrated the futility of any program of trust-busting which ignores the realities of our mass production economy. But taxation and regulation offer other methods which may be invoked to restrain the abuse of power.

It is not my purpose tonight to attempt to elaborate any legislative program, but only to indicate that areas in which the assistance of government is essential to the success of any recovery effort. The formulation of legislative measures is one of the results which should emerge from the collective deliberations of farmer, labor and industrial groups, working in collaboration with government. It would be a constructive achievement, Mr. Secretary, ladies and gentlemen, if as a result of this meeting in Des Moines, government were to take the initiative of calling a conference of labor, agriculture, and industry, to consider and adopt a program for the full realization of our resources of man, machines, and soil. Let us see how far we are ready to go in cooperating for the general good. We must go any length, because, ladies and gentlemen, unless we solve these problems through democratic processes, some demagogues will get into power and solve them for us; solve them in the way of the destruction of everything worthwhile in civilized life. We cannot afford not to cooperate, inspired by the will to succeed. In this great effort, there is among us the collective intelligence and ingenuity needed to chart the way. I am confident that such a conference could contribute much to the reconstruction of a national economy which will guarantee work and an abundant life for all.

GOVERNMENT; ADMINISTRATION
OF JUSTICE

THE 150th ANNIVERSARY OF THE FIRST CONGRESS¹

CHARLES E. HUGHES

The Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, Charles Evans Hughes, delivered this address in the House of Representatives at Washington on March 4, 1939

Here were gathered the Chief Executive of the United States, the Cabinet, the Supreme Court, both bodies of the legislative branch, to celebrate the 150th anniversary of the first session of Congress. Presiding were the heads of the two Houses, John Nance Garner, of the Senate, and Speaker William Bankhead, of the House. The program included music (Mrs Gladys Swarthout, John Charles Thomas). Speeches were given by Mr. Bankhead, Key Pittman, President *pro tempore* of the Senate, and President Roosevelt whose address followed that of the Chief Justice. Senator Alben Barkley of Kentucky in introducing the Chief Justice stated. "It is my great honor and no less a pleasure to present to you today the eleventh Justice of the United States. He has already served longer than five of the other ten. Whether he shall outserve all of his predecessors, I make no prediction. I am happy to record that he seems to be in robust health of mind and body.

"But whether he shall serve as long as Marshall or Taney or Waite or Fuller or White, I think posterity will assign to him a place among the ablest, most influential, and most profound jurists and legal philosophers who have ever served upon the Bench as its presiding Justice. In profound legal learning, in impressive exposition, in the dignity of his bearing, I dare say no previous Justice excelled him. We all take pride in his contributions to the administrative and judicial history of America. I take pride in the broad accomplishments of his intellectual processes, as well as the depth of his moral foundations, which are part of his character, and have made him so impressive a figure in whatever capacity he has chosen to occupy in his long public service. I present to you the Chief Justice of the United States."

Mr. President, Mr. Vice President, Mr. Speaker, Members of the Senate and House of Representatives, Gentlemen of the Diplomatic Corps, Ladies and Gentlemen:

¹ House Document 212, 76th Congress, first session. Reprinted through the courtesy of Chief Justice Hughes.

I thank you, Senator Barkley, from the depths of my heart for your very generous words

The most significant fact in connection with this anniversary is that after 150 years, notwithstanding expansion of territory, enormous increase in population and profound economic changes, despite direct attack and subversive influences, there is every indication that the vastly preponderant sentiment of the American people is that our form of government shall be preserved.

We come from our distinct departments of governmental activity to testify to our unity of aim in maintaining that form of government in accordance with our common pledge. We are here not as masters, but as servants, not to glory in power, but to attest our loyalty to the commands and restrictions laid down by our sovereign, the people of the United States, in whose name and by whose will we exercise our brief authority. If as such representatives we have, as Benjamin Franklin said—"no more durable preeminence than the different grains in an hourglass"—we serve our hour by unremitting devotion to the principles which have given our Government both stability and capacity for orderly progress in a world of turmoil and revolutionary upheavals.

Gratifying as is the record of achievement, it would be extreme folly to engage in mere laudation or to surrender to the enticing delusions of a thoughtless optimism. Forms of government, however well contrived, cannot assure their own permanence. If we owe to the wisdom and restraint of the fathers a system of government which has thus far stood the test, we all recognize that it is only by wisdom and restraint in our own day that we can make that system last. If today we find ground for confidence that our institutions which have made for liberty and strength will be maintained, it will not be due to abundance of physical resources or to productive capacity, but because these are at the command of a people who still cherish the principles which underlie our system and because of the general appreciation of what is essentially sound in our governmental structure.

With respect to the influences which shape public opinion, we live in a new world. Never have these influences operated more directly, or with such variety of facile instruments, or with such overwhelming force. We have mass production in opinion as well as in goods.

The grasp of tradition and of sectional prejudgment is loosened. Postulates of the past must show cause. Our institutions will not be preserved by veneration of what is old, if that is simply expressed in the formal ritual of a shrine. The American people are eager and responsive. They listen attentively to a vast multitude of appeals and, with this receptivity, it is only upon their sound judgment that we can base our hope for a wise conservatism with continued progress and appropriate adaptation to new needs.

We shall do well on this anniversary if the thought of the people is directed to the essentials of our democracy. Here in this body we find the living exponents of the principle of representative government,—not government by direct mass action, but by representation which means leadership as well as responsiveness and accountability

Here, the ground-swells of autocracy, destructive of parliamentary independence, have not yet upset or even disturbed the authority and responsibility of the essential legislative branch of democratic institutions. We have a national Government equipped with vast powers which have proved to be adequate to the development of a great nation, and at the same time maintaining the balance between centralized authority and local autonomy.

It has been said that to preserve that balance, if we did not have states we should have to create them. In our 48 states we have the separate sources of power necessary to protect local interests and thus also to preserve the central authority, in the vast variety of our concerns, from breaking down under its own weight. Our states, each with her historic background and supported by the loyal sentiment of her citizens, afford opportunity for the essential activity of political units, the advantages of which no artificial territorial arrangement could secure.

If our checks and balances sometimes prevent the speedy action which is thought desirable, they also assure in the long run a more deliberate judgment. And what the people really want, they generally get. With the ultimate power of change through amendment in their hands they are always able to obtain whatever a preponderant and abiding sentiment demands.

We not only praise individual liberty but our constitutional system has the unique distinction of insuring it. Our guaranties of fair trials, of due process in the protection of life, liberty and property—which stands between the citizens and arbitrary power—of religious freedom, of free speech, free press and free assembly, are the safeguards which have been erected against the abuses threatened by gusts of passion and prejudice which in misguided zeal would destroy the basic interests of democracy.

We protect the fundamental right of minorities, in order to save democratic government from destroying itself by the excesses of its own power.

The firmest ground for confidence in the future is that more than ever we realize that, while democracy must have its organization and controls, its vital breath is individual liberty.

I am happy to be here as the representative of the tribunal which is charged with the duty of maintaining, through the decision of controversies, these constitutional guaranties. We are a separate but not an independent arm of government. You, not we, have the purse and the sword. You, not we, determine the establishment and the jurisdiction of the lower Federal courts and the bounds of the appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court.

The Congress first assembled on March 4, 1789, and on September 24, 1789, as its twentieth enactment, passed the Judiciary Act—to establish the judicial courts of the United States—a statute which is a monument of wisdom, one of the most satisfactory acts in the long history of notable congressional legislation. It may be said to take rank in our annals as next in importance to the Constitution itself.

In thus providing the judicial establishment, and in equipping and sustaining it, you have made possible the effective functioning of the department of government which is designed to safeguard with judicial impartiality and independence the interests of liberty.

But in the great enterprise of making democracy workable, we are all partners. One member of our body politic cannot say to another—"I have no need of thee." We work in successful cooperation by being true, each department to its own function, and all to the spirit which pervades our institutions,—exalting the processes of reason, seeking through the very limitations of power the promotion of the wise use of power, and finding the ultimate security of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness, and the promise of continued stability and a rational progress, in the good sense of the American people.

FOR A THIRD TERM¹

REXFORD GUY TUGWELL

Mr. Tugwell's speech represented the affirmative in a joint debate with Raymond Moley before the New York Herald Tribune's Eighth Annual Forum on current problems, held on October 25, 1938, at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel in New York City. Three thousand women made up the audience. The general theme of this session of the conference was "Shall We Break with Tradition?"

Special interest was attached to the views of these two speakers inasmuch as formerly both had professorships at Columbia University and had followed the invitation of President Roosevelt to work at Washington in the early recovery program of the administration in the spring of 1933, following the Bank Holiday. Mrs. Ogden Reid, vice-president of the *New York Herald-Tribune*, presided over the various sessions, including the Tugwell-Moley debate. In introducing Mr. Tugwell, Mrs. Reid said, "Yesterday it was stated in the press that a 'third term for President Roosevelt' would be discussed. This was a mistake. The speeches of the two men will present, from an academic standpoint only, the values for and against of preserving or breaking with an American tradition."

"The first speaker, following many years' experience as professor of economics at Columbia, was associated with the present government in Washington as Assistant Secretary of Agriculture and later Under Secretary and Resettlement Administrator."

The general theme of the conference was "America Facing Tomorrow's World." Appearing on the program were R. A. Millikan, President Roosevelt, President Robert Hutchins of Chicago, and many other notables. Mrs. Reid stated: "I am proud to think that the sessions of the Forum have given an example of the blessing of free speech. As has been the custom of these gatherings, differing shades of political, economic, and social opinions have been represented."

The Tugwell-Moley debate was widely commented upon, and the discussion was generally considered a draw.

Whether presidents of the United States ought, under any circumstances, to be given a third term is not, it seems to me, a matter of principle, but rather one of those expedient questions which we learn the answers to after long experience.

¹ Through the courtesy of the author. Reprinted from the *United States News*, November 7, 1938.

And as yet there has been no experience. Lacking this there is a good deal of loose talk about "tradition." I don't know exactly what makes a tradition; but I feel certain that traditions are not imposed on a people!

And opposition to a third term in the present case is, I am convinced, special pleading on the part of those who are interested to prevent a particular man from continuing in office. It is not a sentiment which the American people especially cherish.

It is sheer accident that no president in our history has yet had a third term; several have been willing; and in no instance can it honestly be contended that a candidate for the office has failed because that issue was raised against him.

During the first few years of our history we were not too far removed from monarchy, and Washington's famous refusal to serve longer followed the actual suggestion that he might become king.

But since then there has been nothing remotely similar. And as for the more recent intimations of dictatorship, no one, so far as I know, has suggested such a thing who wants it; it comes from those who hope to build a boggy out of it.

But there can be other kinds of dictatorships. For instance, the current "little group of willful men" who control the Senate frequently maneuver themselves into a position of dominance. But their authority in politics is never given an ugly name—at least by the reactionaries, who, in this case, would be doing the name-calling.

On the whole, the contention that we have a traditional repugnance to third terms is something which all true Democrats ought to examine before accepting.

It is my own belief that "moral" opposition to a third term comes almost wholly from those who think that government, and especially the executive branch, ought to be kept weak.

There used to be a good deal of such sentiment growing out of the long struggle for personal liberty. We were still close to that struggle in 1789. Some of our Constitution

makers were, in fact, more concerned with guarding individuals against the State than they were with making the State effective in its control over individuals. It was better they felt, that nothing should be done than that the rights of citizens should be invaded.

And although these precious rights have since been tortured, sometimes into liberties for corporations and for men of great property, the appeal is still made in the old terms just as though no change in industry and finance had taken place through all these years.

Those who, for reasons of their own, have wanted government to be weak have made common cause with those who, because they knew how to control and to manipulate government as it was, did not want to see the balance upset.

Only very gradually did the demand for action become more important than that for inaction. And even then it was confined largely to certain disadvantaged groups. These came to see that if the national government did not do some jobs for them they would not be done at all. Corporations exploited their public freely when the State was paralyzed. But any benefits for the masses depended on vigorous government action.

These groups have become so large and so insistent that ways have had to be found to meet their demands. Somewhere some force had to be discovered which could move the vast engine of Federal power off center and start it working for the general good.

This force had to oppose itself to the inertia written into the Constitution itself which had come to benefit private privilege rather than public good. Inertia was guarded by our famous system of checks and balances—a system almost, but not quite, in complete adjustment. A government of executive, legislative and judicial departments, carefully separated and pitted against each other, prevented action often enough. A bicameral legislature, which involved a Senate elected for a long term and with equal representation for states regardless of their population, went even further to insure sterility.

But human institutions are seldom perfect. When the forefathers gave the Senate certain executive functions, such as the power to confirm nominations and to ratify treaties, they gave it a slight advantage which, coupled with its local affiliations, it was bound to pursue with an energy proportioned to the weight of the interests it served.

Its aggressiveness in defense of inertia was, of course, aimed at the Executive.

For the Constitution makers had not foreseen the growth of political parties, and when they developed the president naturally assumed leadership of the one in power. This gave him a touch with the people which was more direct and more responsive than existed in any other part of the government.

The president, in fact, became the people's champion. Also he had a certain advantage, for, if the Senate had executive powers, the president had some legislative ones; he could recommend the legislation which the people had demanded of his party and he could veto that which he did not feel to be in their interest.

There thus grew up a continuing conflict between president and Senate which has risen to dramatic climaxes many times in our history—the president, driven by his duties of leadership, seeking to enhance Federal control over economic forces; the Senate, restrained by ties with local interests whose privileges were in jeopardy, and with only weak responsibility to party or to people, seeking to check the Executive and to hamper his efforts.

Efforts to reform our upper house have not succeeded. At about the same time in history the attempt was made here and in Great Britain—succeeded there—and the House of Lords is now reduced to becoming impotent. It wasted itself here on an amendment providing for direct election, but no change was made in the Senate's powers, and no reform of its rules has taken place. It remains immovable, powerful and by nature committed to inaction.

Presidents, in consequence, have often been more conspicuous for frustration than for achievement. On the one hand, because of party leadership and of responsibility to the electorate, they have moved in a constant glare of accountability. In a real sense they have become, as time has passed, less important as executives and more so as pushers of legislation. As such, and because of the daily and hourly reminders flooding in upon them of people's expectations, they have sought to circumvent checks and upset balances. They have frantically groped for leverage to move the Senate.

Time and again they have been checked. For the Senate has felt little compulsion to act. It is 96 persons, not one; and among 96 responsibility can be shifted about until it is lost to sight. On the days of crucial voting it is easy to be ill or to be away on pressing business. And it is an old art to ruin bills by innocent amendments. There are a thousand nasty ways of repulsing presidents who push too hard. This urgent need of the Executive and resistance of the Senate have, between them, led to a species of trading by which a strange Senate control over administrative departments has been gained in exchange for some measure of that cooperation which the Executive has so desperately reached for.

The vast number of appointments, the disposal of privileges and immunities, which any new president possessed, were greedily eyed by senators who knew the strength of their positions. In the end they usually got enough of them to tie the Executive pretty tight to their policy of inaction.

We see, then, that a kind of cycle develops. Presidents are busy, during their first term, getting into legislation what they can of promises made during the campaign. They may have some help from friendly senators, but of these only one-third are elected at the same time. And of this one-third a certain number belongs to other parties, and others to different factions of the same party. Still others have gone along "on the party leader's coat-tails," as we say, bowing before his temporary popularity but determined to bring it to an early end, and feeling independent because their term is longer anyway than his.

But the president must trade with all of them who can be got to go along at all. He puts in pawn the jobs at his disposal; his chief political lieutenant—perhaps from a cabinet post—may go further than he in granting privileges. By these means a certain progress is made. But it is costly, and at the end, the president is usually a sadder and a wiser man. The Senate is complacent to a degree which depends on how much has been given away in return for favors received. But normally inertia wins.

If the president fails to convince the people that he is working in their interest or that he is effective at it, they may not even give him a second term, much less a third but if he is successful in either, and especially if he attracts general approval by his efforts, he is returned to office in spite of Senate opposition—and the duel goes on.

It is at this time—at the beginning of the second term—that the worst estrangement comes. It is a life-and-death struggle this time. For by now, although the President knows how strong his opposition is, he feels that the people are with him. And he makes an even more determined attempt to put into action the program to which he is pledged.

But the opposition is in a more strategic position than before, since it has less to gain from yielding. He has allocated most of the jobs at his disposal, for instance, and so has not this means to persuade affection. Furthermore, he now finds that he heads a branch of government which he can direct only nominally because its personnel owes allegiance to his adversaries. Administrative disloyalty begins to disrupt the conduct even of ordinary business, and scandalous inefficiency becomes a real danger.

Second terms, for the greater part, are stalemates. Little is done, that is, in the way of legislation. After a time, of course, the worst political appointees are somehow got rid of; the president and his Cabinet, having turned from their legislative functions in despair, attempt to purge and repair the executive agencies already in existence.

On the whole this condition of stalemate, and of Executive preoccupation with administration, is one which suits

the reactionary. He is prospering as things are. He wants nothing changed. And the Senate is playing his game satisfactorily, thus fulfilling the function which he had anticipated for it.

The Executive at the end of this time, may well be in a mood to fight, to go to the people and tell them the truth about their "so-called representatives." If he is a real man, and if his energies have not been exhausted by struggle, he will want to tear up the earth this time in the effort to do those things which he has become more and more convinced that the people want. This is, I believe, the reason third terms find support among progressives and opposition among reactionaries.

Eight years is not long for a reform government to complete itself. It may easily take more than that. If reactionaries can stop it before completion they will bless their luck, but progressives are committed to the full cycle of reconstruction.

No superstition can blind them to this urgent need. Their purpose may well require the continuance of that certain man. If it does, he will have to serve, and the third term bogey will need to be laid away and forgotten.

CIVIL LIBERTIES ¹

FRANK MURPHY

The Honorable Frank Murphy, Attorney General of the United States, delivered this speech over the radio on March 27, 1939, at 10:30 P.M. over the Blue Network of the National Broadcasting Company. The address was on the National Radio Forum and arranged by the Washington Evening Star in cooperation with the National Broadcasting Company.

Democracy today is in a fight for its life. Wherever we look we see determined efforts to tear down the things that the masses of mankind have been painfully struggling to achieve all through the ages. The right of self-government, the right of every man to speak his thoughts freely, the opportunity to express his individual nature in his daily life and work, the privilege of believing in the religion that his own conscience tells him is right—all these precious things that men have won through blood and anguish are hanging in the balance.

We must not let the scales drop the other way. If we do, we betray civilization itself. We must fight to keep these treasures just as bravely and vigorously as those who have gone before us fought to gain them. Democracy will not save itself. It isn't something automatic that will go on and on by its own power. We can't just be dreamy and sentimental about it. We must bestir ourselves and see that it works smoothly and efficiently in every respect. We must actually *apply* the principles of democracy to the world we live in—give them life and substance and meaning.

It will not be enough to do just half the job. We will have to be thorough and conscientious, because those who would like to destroy democracy are doing a thorough job

¹ By permission of the author. Text furnished through the courtesy of Honorable Frank Murphy.

of it wherever and whenever they have the chance. They are giving no quarter—neither must we.

The phase of democracy that I have in mind particularly tonight is civil liberty. But I want to emphasize once more that our fight will not be won by half-way measures. Not only must we make *civil liberty* a living reality, but the democratic ideal must be applied in every part of our life—social, political, and economic.

Perhaps it would be helpful to start at the beginning and ask, "Why have civil liberties at all?" Generally speaking, we believe in them because we are convinced they represent the best possible compromise between the governmental regulation that is necessary for an orderly society and the absolute freedom that has no limits except the laws of nature. But there is another reason that comes closer home. We who are devotees of democracy believe in civil liberties because we know that without such rights as freedom of religion, freedom of speech and press, freedom to assemble peacefully and to petition our government for the correction of wrongs, democracy cannot possibly exist.

If this, in brief, is the reason for our faith in civil liberties, what is our present situation?

It is common for orators on patriotic occasions to point to the early years of our Union as the period in which love of civil liberty was at its height. They remind us that it was the denial of liberty that drove the Fathers into violent revolution. They point out that the colonies refused to ratify the Constitution until they were assured that a Bill of Rights would be added. From such good evidence, they picture the period surrounding the Revolution as a "Golden Age" of liberty from which, for one reason or another, we have steadily declined.

There is another view—which, I suspect is held by a considerable number of people today—that seems to take civil liberty pretty much for granted. Those who subscribe to it look back over 150 years of political democracy in this country and conclude that what has existed so long

will continue to exist. If they see any present danger to their liberties, it is at best a long way off.

There is a good deal to be said for both these attitudes, and particularly the first. Certainly none of us can forget or ever cease to revere the spirit of those who wrote and embraced the Declaration of Independence. We cannot forget how bravely they took up Patrick Henry's challenge of "liberty or death" and fought their way to liberty at such terrific cost.

But if we examine these attitudes closely, we will find that neither of them is entirely accurate. The first, which views the present with alarm, is unrealistic because actually we have made progress in public tolerance since those early days. As evidence, we need only to recall the notorious Alien and Sedition Acts, legislated and enforced by the last Federalist Administration which preceded the term of Thomas Jefferson. Under the Alien Act, non-citizens could be deported or could be imprisoned for three years without trial or hearing. Under the Sedition Act, a newspaper editor or public speaker or, for that matter, a person in private conversation, could not utter any word which might be interpreted as a reflection on the Administration. Violation of this law could be punished by presidential order without trial, hearing, or the right of appeal. Unbelievable as it may seem today, the proprietors and editors of the four leading anti-Federalist newspapers of the day were prosecuted under this statute for sedition. One man was given a sentence of two years for erecting a sign which read, "Down-fall to the Traitors of America."

In 1800 public feeling against the Alien and Sedition Acts resulted in the election of a new administration. But political persecution was by no means at end. From time to time in the history of the succeeding years we find strong evidence that the group in power or in the majority was actively intolerant of those whose political views differed from their own.

In those days, as now, it needed a broad mind and a great heart to be tolerant of a political philosophy utterly opposed to one's own. Here was an infant nation embarking on a political experiment without equal in the history of the human race. The principle of government by the people was on trial before a world committed almost entirely to government by kings. What could be more natural than that men of strong convictions, each convinced that his way was the best and each one determined that the new experiment must succeed, should come to disagreement over policies and methods? In fact, every ingredient of a period of great stress in the national life was at hand. And it is a time like that when men are most sorely tempted to look upon civil liberty as a protection only to themselves and not to those with whom they disagree.

Obviously we are in a period of that kind today. The danger of class consciousness,—something for which the vast majority of Americans have little sympathy in normal times—has been increased by unemployment and insecurity. The danger is not a theoretical one. It is not something invented in the mind of the social psychologist. It is an actual condition evidenced by happenings that come almost daily to my attention.

Only recently I received a letter from a wife and mother complaining that the small business conducted by her husband and son had been ruined because they opposed the political principles of the city administration. Intimidation had driven their customers away. Here is a form of persecution without benefit of an Alien and Sedition Act!

In another community a young man who actively opposed the boss of the local political machine was indicted on a false charge. He was tried and convicted by a jury consisting entirely of persons connected politically with the leader of the machine. He was denied bail on appeal. After several postponements the case came to the appellate court but not until after the defendant had served his term.

Reports have come to the Department of Justice that persons who have testified before Congressional Committees

have been beaten or discharged from their employment. In other words, for exercising the elementary right of conveying their views to their government, they were subjected to physical cruelty or loss of their jobs

I believe most of you will remember the recent Harlan County prosecution which brought to light widespread denial of the rights of workmen to organize and bargain collectively. That unfortunate condition is steadily being corrected, and I believe that as time goes on there will be less and less of it.

Events such as these are the reason for my earlier statement that the casual attitude which takes civil liberties for granted and recognizes no danger to them is just as unrealistic as the view that the American people are steadily leaving their love of liberty behind them.

I do not wish to appear to you as an alarmist. I have the greatest confidence that the American people will ride through this storm with their liberties and their faith in those liberties unharmed.

I only want to repeat and to stress as strongly as I can that warning which John Curran uttered 150 years ago for his generation, for our own, and for all that are to follow: "The condition upon which God has given liberty to man is eternal vigilance." My purpose is to emphasize that if we wish to keep what we have gained and so long held, we must be alert. We must be on guard against those tendencies and attitudes, *in ourselves as well as others*, that open the door to one denial of liberty and then another.

The government, of course, can help us keep watch. It can take the initiative and lead the way. But we must remember—and this is important—that government cannot do the whole job.

I am afraid that a great deal of the present apathy toward civil rights traces back to the notion that their protection is the sole responsibility of the Federal Government. I am afraid there is considerable misunderstanding as to the meaning and effect of the Federal Bill of Rights which includes the first ten amendments of the Federal Constitution.

Students of law know, of course, that the Bill of Rights in the Federal Constitution is a prohibition on the *Federal* Government. In other words, it forbids the *Federal* Government to deny to the people those liberties of speech and assembly, of religion and the press, that are so vital to our freedom. Each state having its own constitution and Bill of Rights, it was assumed by the authors of the Federal Constitution that the state governments would protect their own citizens from infringement of these liberties not caused by the Federal Government.

Since the Federal Constitution was adopted, however, another amendment—the Fourteenth,—has been added, which provides that no State shall make any law abridging the privileges and immunities of United States citizens, or deprive any person of life, liberty or property without due process, or deny to him the equal protection of the laws. Under this amendment it has been held that a citizen may invoke the aid of the Federal courts when he is denied full protection by the courts of his State.

I do not wish to give the impression that the Federal Government is powerless to protect civil liberty. For although most of a citizen's rights are created and protected by the Constitution and laws of his State, there are certain rights which he obtains not from his State but because he is a citizen of the United States. The distinction should be kept in mind, however, when the Federal Government fails to act in situations that seem to call for its intervention. It serves to explain why it does not take action in every situation where some liberty has been abused.

The Federal Government today is determined, nevertheless, to protect civil liberties by all means available to it. It will not be for this faction or that, this class or that class, this nationality or that one, but for all the people. We propose to protect civil liberties for the business man and the laborer alike, for the Jew and the Gentile, and the people of all races and creeds, whatever their origin. We believe it must be done consistently and with a fine impartiality—otherwise, it cannot be truly democratic.

In this determination we have recently created a separate unit on civil rights in the Criminal Division of the Department of Justice. One of the first duties of this unit has been to consider and determine just where the Federal Government can act, and to define the limits of its jurisdiction. Within those limits it will exercise its second duty of ordering investigation and prosecuting for violations of rights which the United States Government is charged with protecting.

The unit is now at work under my supervision. The complaints of citizens which have already reached me have been given careful consideration. In many cases, we have had to reply that the matters complained of were so completely outside of the Federal Government's jurisdiction that we could do nothing. In other cases, we have proceeded to obtain the facts and to determine whether or not a Federal law has been violated.

Yet, when all this is done, when the Federal Government has done its part, and when the State has given all the protection it can, something more is required. The courts cannot review every denial of civil rights that may occur in our midst. Year by year since the Constitution was adopted, it has become more and more obvious that tolerance cannot be enforced by law. No government, however strong, can guarantee complete observance of the spirit of the Bill of Rights. The Golden Rule cannot be made effective by United States Marshals. The great protector of civil liberty, the final source of its enforcement, now and always, is the invincible power of public opinion.

No court or law can make wholly inviolate the right of freedom of speech. Once it is denied by ordinance or some arbitrary exercise of power, what decree or court award can restore to the citizen denied, his right to speak on that occasion? Only the insistent will of a tolerant and democratic and informed people can insure freedom at all times to the voice that utters an unpopular view.

The courts can provide a *remedy* for lawlessness, but for its complete *prevention* there is only one place to look, and

that is to an overwhelming public determination that it must not happen here.

It is anything but an easy job, this task of protecting civil liberty, and it is made twice burdensome by the fact that there is little pleasure in enforcing liberty for those who would deny liberty to others if they were in power. It is not easy to detest an extremist philosophy and yet insist on the right of any man to advocate it freely.

Yet, apparently we must do just this if we are to practice our faith in democracy. We must remember that America was founded by men who came to these shores to escape intolerance in other lands. We must remember that the political system which they advocated, fought for, and established under the Constitution was heresy in the eyes of the government that ruled them. We must never forget that the democratic way is not to crush the alien view but to let it be heard and to defeat it by demonstrating that our own way of living contributes the most to human happiness.

Only in this way—through the vigilance of a citizen body thoroughly schooled in the meaning and purpose of civil liberty—will we achieve the general enjoyment of civil liberty. Government, by precept and example, and by providing remedies in individual cases of denial of liberty, can make a large contribution. But in the last analysis, the American tradition of individual freedom, handed down to us by Roger Williams, Thomas Jefferson, Abraham Lincoln, and many another devotee of liberty, will be carried forward only if each of us practices every day that faith in which Voltaire is said to have declared to his adversary, "I disapprove of what you say, but I will defend to the death your right to say it."

THE HINES POLICY-NUMBERS CASE ¹

THOMAS E. DEWEY

Thomas E. Dewey delivered this final summation speech in the Hines Lottery Case, on February 24, 1939. In August, 1939, James J. Hines, Tammany leader of the Sixteenth Assembly District of New York City, was brought to trial, accused of protecting Dutch Schultz and other underground figures in their operation of the illegal "policy-numbers racket." New York City District Attorney, Thomas E. Dewey, opened the case for the State before Supreme Court Judge Ferdinand Pecora. Lloyd Paul Stryker was attorney for the defense.

Young Dewey, special prosecutor for New York City, and then elected prosecuting attorney in 1937, had to his credit one acquittal and seventy-two convictions in two years as Special Prosecutor of rackets and racketeers, including those of the restaurants and trucking businesses.

The first Hines case ended in a mistrial in August, 1938, when Justice Pecora, on the ground that a reference by Dewey had prejudiced the jury, stopped the proceedings. When the trial was resumed in February, 1939, before Judge Charles C. Nott, Jr., Dewey and Stryker again became the opposing counsel. Dewey's star witness, numbers racketeer George Weinberg, had committed suicide. Moreover, the defense had of course secured a complete preview of the State's case. Dewey, in the final summation, spent an entire day analyzing the argument. He took up one by one the witnesses called to support his testimony and established each, in turn breaking down those for the defense. In contrast to Mr. Stryker, who "declaimed boldly" Dewey spoke in a low-pitched voice that could hardly be heard in the back of the crowded court-room. His mode was conversational and his manner that of a "man reciting facts." The excerpt included here represents merely the conclusion of his address to the jury.

Hines was found guilty on all counts. Dewey affirmed that the conviction was "a reassertion of democracy's ability to clean house." The verdict, four months earlier, might have given Dewey the governorship of New York State. As it was, in the campaign intervening between the first and second trials, Dewey lost by some 50,000 votes in his campaign against Governor Lehman. The ultimate political effect of this successful prosecution in the Hines case, upon Dewey as a Republican presidential possibility remains to be determined.

¹ By permission of the author. Reprinted from the *New York Times*, February 25, 1939.

They've all got to be liars if there is anything to this defense, because practically all of them gave testimony about things which corroborate in every detail the testimony of other witnesses. You are compelled to believe every essential bit of testimony by every witness in this case from beginning to end, despite the adjectives that may be used against them. You are compelled not only, I am sure, by your own impression of their frankness but also by the insurmountable mass of sheer facts

They are not the only people who have to be corrupt if there is to be anything to this defense. I must be, because it is implied that I or my assistants supplied grand jury testimony so witnesses could rig up the story. Not only that, but each of my assistants has to be guilty of some conniving, each of these police officers has to be, and the investigators on my staff.

Gentlemen, when a defense has to do that, the conclusion is inevitable. It is not a pleasant task for a District Attorney to go through a case like this once, to say nothing of twice, but there is a high duty that comes to all of us in our lives. We have ours every day. We have to do it. If we did not do it, civilization and the democracy of which my learned adversary spoke, would be in a very, very sad way.

Sentence in this case on the defendant is secondary. It is no concern of mine. The Court can suspend sentence, give one day, one year, whatever he pleases. That is up to the Court. It is none of your business and none of my business. I don't want it to be. The important thing is that you declare to the people of New York, the police of New York, that they are free, that they won't any longer be betrayed by a corrupt alliance between crime and politics, that that alliance is going to be smashed by this jury and branded as something we won't stand for, because we want to keep the kind of a system we have in this country and we don't want it polluted by a betrayer and protection of gangsters by political leaders.

You are good New Yorkers and you love your city. You want your city to get better and better and to remain and become cleaner. You want to remove cancers that grow at the heart of your government, wreck the morale of your police force, wreck the morale of your courts and wreck the morale of any public official who has to come within the contaminating influence of a politician operating with gangster money as his background, and if you do not do that, gentlemen, what are the consequences? What notice are you serving on the police and on the public and on everybody else? You know; I don't even need to outline it.

Here is the very thing which makes organized crime possible. Without it there couldn't be organized crime for five minutes in this country, unless the paralyzing hand of a crooked politician weren't available to break an honest cop or to tell a magistrate what to do, or to use gangster funds to elect a public prosecutor who is under his control.

Let us decide what we want for ourselves and our community. Do we want to remove that cancer? Do we want to see that in the future it shan't happen again? Do we want to keep the processes of our system clean or do we want to say, "No, no, we will go back and take the consequences," and then you will have the kind of things my friend was talking about. No, I don't think we want that. I think we want to see that the men who are ultimately responsible for these things are punished for their sins, that notice is served on the world that that shan't happen again, that for these things we know there is a certain retribution visited by the community, which is you

We are helpless, gentlemen, unless that is visited. I know you will do your duty. I know you will not say, "Go back, prosecute the players and the collectors, prosecute the burglar who gets caught, prosecute the boy who steals from the stand on the corner, but don't get the man who sent him to steal; prosecute the cheap and the petty, and perpetuate and turn loose those who made it possible"

I thank you for your long attention. I know you will do your duty as citizens of New York.

SCIENCE

SCIENCE AND THE WORLD TOMORROW¹

ROBERT A. MILLIKAN

This address was delivered in New York on April 20th, 1939, at a dinner of the Merchants and Manufacturers celebrating the opening of the New York World's Fair. Six hundred persons attended the dinner, held at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel. Mrs. August Belmont was toastmaster. On the program also were George McAneny, Chairman of the Fair Board; Juan Trippe, President of the Pan American Airways, speaking for industry; Dr. Walter Damrosch, speaking for the arts; and Dr. Millikan, Nobel prize winner, and Chairman of the Executive Council of the California Institute of Technology, representing science. American periodicals prominently reported the address (see, for example, the editorial, *New York Times*, April 23, 1939).

Even though "prophecy is the most gratuitous form of mistake," and even though there is obviously the possibility that something so completely foreign to my thinking may happen as to make any prognosis that I may hazard now look ridiculous in the years to come, yet I am going to be foolish and rash enough to forecast that, barring the return of the dark ages through the triumph the world over of tyranny over freedom, of the spirit of world conquest over the spirit of reason and peaceful change, life in America fifty or a hundred years hence will not differ nearly as much from the life of today as the life of today differs from that of a century or even a half-century ago. The processes and techniques that have been responsible for the enormous changes of the last century will continue to improve our economic and social well-being, but the main changes will come from a more general understanding by the voting public of the nature of these processes and a more intelligent use of them. This will mean the gradual elimination of the effort to violate natural and social laws, or arithmetically

¹ By permission of the author. Text furnished through the courtesy of Dr. Millikan.

stated, to make two plus two equal six, as we have been so ignorantly and so disastrously trying to do in much of our social floundering of recent years.

So long as one is considering only the physical or biological basis of change, the informed and competent scientist has some reason for confidence in his analysis as to the general direction which progress can and must take. He at least knows a great many sorts of things that will *not* happen, and these are in the main the very things that the uninformed dreamers and wishful thinkers—the emotional pseudo-reformers, not the real ones—hope and expect to see happen. Thus, we shall never be able to transform the energy released in the burning of coal or in the absorption of the sun's rays directly and completely into electrical energy. Indeed, we shall never be able to go very much farther in this direction than we have already gone.

Today the most efficient internal combustion engines transform into work 35 per cent of the heat energy released in the burning of the fuel, and it is safe to predict that in continuous operation we shall never be able to make very great advances beyond this limit. By that I do not mean that through improvements in details efficiencies in the neighborhood of say 50 per cent are completely out of the question. But in any case, the so-called second law of thermodynamics, which has now taken its place as a part of the core of established knowledge in physics, stands in the way of the realization of the dreams of the multitude of inventors and magicians who still want to transform the sun's heat rays directly and completely into work. Though the knowledge that it cannot be done is less than a hundred years old, it is about as firmly established as is the law of gravitation.

I have chosen the foregoing illustration because it lies at the very base of any correct analysis of what science has done and of what it is capable of doing in the future in bettering man's lot on earth. Let us look first at what it *has* done, for this will enable us to understand better

what it can do. When in 1825 my grandfather loaded into a covered wagon his young wife, his Lares and Penates, and all his worldly goods, and trekked west from Stockbridge, Mass., first to the Western Reserve in Ohio, and again in 1838 to the banks of the Rock River in western Illinois, the conditions of that migration, the motives prompting it, and mode of travel of the emigrants, their various ways of meeting their needs and solving their problems, their whole outlook upon life, were extraordinarily like those which existed four thousand years earlier when Abraham trekked westward from Ur of the Chaldees. In a word, the changes that have occurred within the past hundred years not only in the external conditions under which the average man, at least in this western world, passes his life on earth, but in his superstitions, such as the taboo on the number thirteen or on Friday sailings (why, my own grandmother carried a dried potato in her pocket to keep off rheumatism) in his fundamental beliefs, in his philosophy, in his conception of religion, in his whole world outlook, are probably greater than those that occurred during the preceding four thousand years all put together. Life seems to remain static for thousands of years and then to shoot forward with amazing speed. The last century has been one of those periods of extraordinary change, the most amazing in human history.

If, then, you ask me to put into one sentence the cause of that recent rapid and enormous change, I should reply, *it is found in the discovery and utilization of the means by which heat energy can be made to do man's work for him.* The key to the whole development is found in the use of power machines, and it is a most significant statistical fact that the standard of living in the various countries of the world follows closely the order in which so-called labor-saving devices have been most widely put into use. In other words, the average man has today more of goods and services to consume in about the proportion in which he has been able to produce more of goods and services through the aid of the power machines which have been put into

his hands. In this country there is now expended about 13.5 horsepower hours per day per capita—the equivalent of 100 human slaves for each of us; in England the figure is 6.7, in Germany 6.0, in France 4.5, in Japan 1.8, in Russia 0.9, in China 0.5. In the last analysis, this use of power is why our most important social changes have come about. This is why *we* no longer drive our ships with human slaves chained to the oars as did the Romans and the Greeks. This is why we no longer enslave whole peoples as did the Pharaohs, for building our public structures, and lash them to their tasks. This is why ten times as many boys and girls are in the high school today in the United States as were there in 1890—more than five million now, half a million then. This is why we have now an eight hour day instead of, as then, a ten, a twelve—or sometime a fourteen-hour day. This is why we have on the average an automobile for every family in the country. This is why the lowest class of male labor, i.e., unskilled labor, gets nearly twice as much in real wages in the United States as in England, three times as much as in Germany or France and thirteen times as much as in Russia, and this is why the most abused class of labor in the world, domestic service, is even better off relatively in this country though completely unorganized, i.e., through the unhampered operation of economic laws, than is any other class of labor, skilled or unskilled.

Do not think that these are the one-sided pronouncements merely of an enthusiastic scientist. Anyone can check them who will begin to study them. Listen to President Kar Compton's formulation of the results of his similar historical studies. He says.

"From the days of the cave man, all through history up to the modern era of science, there were only two primitive recipes for securing the materials desired for the more abundant life. One was to work hard and long in order to

of life from some one else, by theft, conquest, taxation or produce more, and the other was to take the good things exploitation.

"To get the good things of life by taking them from others is a primitive instinct, undoubtedly developed by the age-old struggle for existence. We have all seen monkeys, or sea gulls, or wolves, or pigs snatching food from each other, fighting to possess it, or shouldering each other away from the trough. When human beings carry this philosophy too far beyond the accepted standards, as did Jesse James and John Dillinger, we call them 'public enemies'. But this same philosophy of taking what we want from others, by violence and trickery, or by legalized strategy and force, has run all through human history.

"But in recent times, modern science has developed to give mankind, for the first time in the history of the human race, a way of securing a more abundant life which does not simply consist in taking away from some one else. Science really creates wealth and opportunity where they did not exist before. Whereas the old order was based on competition, the new order of science makes possible, for the first time, a cooperative creative effort in which every one is the gainer and no one the loser.

"For this reason, *I believe that the advent of modern science is the most important social event in all history.* It marks the point at which men have come to understand themselves and the world they live in well enough to begin systematically to control the hidden forces of nature to their advantage. Already science has done wonders to raise the standard of living and of knowledge, but these hidden forces are so great that we are assuredly only at the beginning of things possible.

"Some significant facts regarding the effect of the machine on the wages and employment of the worker are these: Counting 1840 as about the year in which power machinery came to be important in the United States, we find a steady increase since that date in the ratio of average wages to aver-

age prices of commodities, so that it is now about seven times what it was in 1840. In other words, the average wage earner in America can today buy seven times as much with his wages as he could in 1840; or more than twice as much as he could in 1910. Also despite increasing population and increasing use of labor-saving machinery the percentage of our population gainfully employed increased 25 per cent between 1870 and 1930.

"More material progress has been made during the past one hundred and fifty years under the American system of free business enterprise than during all the preceding centuries in world history. This record of achievement is a challenge to those who would radically change that system. . . Under this system, the United States with a population of less than 7 per cent of the world's total controls about 40 per cent of the wealth of the world. One hundred years ago the average person had about 52 wants of which 16 were regarded as necessities. Today the wants number 484 on the average, of which 94 are looked upon as necessities." ^{2, 3}

These facts, with their primary cause, are basic in enabling us to forecast the possibilities of improvement in the century that is ahead. They make it well nigh certain that we shall increase in economic well-being in the future just as we have in the past, in just the proportion in which we continue to apply science and engineering to our industries and thus produce more and more in goods and services per man hour, thus freeing more and more men, more and more time, and more and more brains for education, for research, for art, and for all the other service industries. There is a saturation point for automobiles and radios, but there is no such thing as saturation in education or the service industries generally.

The foregoing figures demonstrate conclusively, I think, that the interests of labor and capital are one. For what is power? It is what the economist calls capital—the tools and

² *The Social Implications of Scientific Discovery*, published by the American Philosophical Society, Philadelphia, March 15, 1938.

³ This last paragraph of the quotation from Compton he in turn takes from a pamphlet distributed by the First National Bank of Boston.

facilities with which we carry on our work. The idea of the Marxian class war is one of the most disastrous fallacies that ever got into human thinking—disastrous to the working man, destroying today his wellbeing.

Civilization consists in the multiplication and refinement of human wants. It is a simple historical fact that these wants have actually developed with great rapidity wherever and whenever labor-saving machines have been rapidly introduced. In 1900 some fifty per cent of our population was on, or supported immediately by, the farm, in 1930 not over twenty-five per cent. Without serious unemployment in that period the millions of displaced farmers found their way into garages, service stations, newly created secretarial jobs, news reporting, a newly created telephone service, advertising, insurance, gardening, domestic service, and a thousand other service industries, and no serious or prolonged unemployment occurred until the enterprisers who normally create the new jobs began to be suppressed, legislated against and scared by unwise financial and political policies. The faster science and engineering are applied to industry the faster we ought to progress. There is literally no other way of comparable effectiveness to raise the standard of living, and the chief element in its effectiveness is in getting more power into the hands of the laborer so that he can produce more for himself, for in the last analysis the laborer taken a whole gets under almost any modern social system practically all that he produces. According to the United States Department of Commerce, in 1936 labor received directly 66.5 per cent of the national income. Indirectly, it received nearly all the rest of it since the idle rich represent an insignificant fraction of the population, and they pass on practically all that they receive to workers of some kind.

My forecast of the future, then, must depend on what the future's sources of power are to be and on the cost of that power. That is why I began with a consideration of the possibility of getting more work out of a pound of coal. At present the main sources of power are coal and oil, with

water playing a minor role and being in general more expensive. This situation will continue for a thousand years, for though the oil will perhaps be gone in fifty years, the coal will last for at least another millenium. The big steam plant is now nearly or quite as efficient as the best diesel motor, but for small power purposes, motor vehicles and the like, the internal combustion engine is and will continue to be indispensable. However, we already know how to make liquid fuel from coal, so that when the oil is gone we shall still be able to get liquid fuel for our internal combustion engines. There are, I think, no other possible sources of power of comparable cheapness. When the oil and the coal are gone we shall get our power either directly from the sun through solar motors, or wind mills or tidal machines, or else indirectly through growing and burning plants; but it will then cost us more than it does now. So far as tapping the energy "locked up in the atoms" is concerned, in my opinion we can count that out. We can of course do it now in principle through radioactivity, but I see no possibility fifty years from now of ever supplying the world's power needs, or even a minute portion of them, from any such source.

For the foregoing reasons, then, fifty years from now the world will look to us, from the point of view of power, not so very different from what it looks now. Air travel will of course have increased, but the great bulk of the freight will go as now by surface vehicles or by steamships propelled in the essential particulars much as they are today. The art of communications, too, is already a pretty well perfected art, and though it may be considerably cheaper than now, more messages being simultaneously carried over a given cable, so far as the techniques used are concerned I do not expect any very radical or startling change.

Among the natural sciences biology has the opportunity to do the big new things so far as their immediate effect on human living is concerned, and I have no doubt that in the field of public health the control of disease, the cessation of the continuous reproduction of the unfit, etc., big

advances will be made, but here I am not a competent witness, and I find on the whole those who are the most competent and informed the most conservative.

The most burning and most uncertain situation about the future has to do with social and political matters, and it should be remembered that all the foregoing forecast was based on the assumption that our present civilization would not be destroyed by man's present or prospective international wickedness, stupidity, and folly. I know of no direct way in which science can prevent that, for I see no prospect of our ever being able to turn some new type of ray upon a dictator filled with the lust of power and conquest and thus transform him into a humanitarian. Indirectly, however, the sciences of explosives and poison gases, of aerodynamics, of communications with its corollary, the rapid spread of *knowledge* among the people, are doing the work. It was the fear of the bombing of London and Paris that prevented the beginning of another world war last September. The peoples of all countries, including the dictatorships, are coming more and more to the realization that such another war can bring only death and destruction to everybody—the end of civilization, not the world domination which the demagogic leader promises. It is the rapid spread of knowledge by the effective methods that modern science has developed that gives good ground for hope that a world war will not come. The fact that the ultimate resources are in the democratic countries, as the science of geology has shown, something like three-fourths of the coal and the metals, the ultimate sources of power, being in these countries and that these countries can be and have already been roused to arm to defend themselves, that is the great influence that makes for continued peace in the world today and that gives promise that a permanent method of assuring peace may ultimately be worked out. But these countries must have the intelligence, the long range selfishness to see the hopelessness, the folly at a time like this of a policy of division and isolation. They must obviously, it seems to me, *join*

their powers in time to show the international bandits the hopelessness of their threatened spring at the throat of the world. If they, including ourselves, will do this then I think there will be no war, and then I stand by my prognosis of a golden age ahead through the further growth of science and its application to the well-being of mankind, and particularly through the further spread of understanding by the voting public that the interests of labor and capital are one and that the class war, like international war, is a terrible menace to human happiness and wellbeing.

EDUCATION

ORGANIZATION AND SUBJECT MATTER OF GENERAL EDUCATION¹

ROBERT M. HUTCHINS

This address was given before the Thirty-fifth Annual Congress on Medical Education and Licensure, Chicago, February 13, 1939. The paper as read embodied much of the educational philosophy which the President of the University of Chicago had expounded on the platform and in print on several other occasions during the preceding twelve months (see for example, the address before the National Education Association, in the NEA Proceedings for 1938, p. 553-9). The views of President Hutchins continued to challenge the university and college world. In the address here included the statement, "I favor awarding the bachelor's degree in general education; I favor awarding it at about the end of the sophomore year," caused comment in the press. (See *Representative American Speeches*, 1937-38, p. 184.)

Since you have two other college presidents on the program to tell you about college education it is obvious that you do not expect from any one of them the answer to your questions about it. You believe, like the rest of the world, that all presidents are liars, and you hope from a study of the differing lies of the three of us to discover the truth for yourselves. Speaking for myself, I find Mr. Conant's lies very persuasive, so much so that I shall drop out of this paper as I go along any lies of my own that are in conflict with his.

I assume that we are all agreed on the purpose of general education and that we want to confine our discussion to its organization and subject matter. I believe that general education should be given as soon as possible, that is, as soon as the student has the tools and the maturity it requires. I think that the program I favor can be experienced with profit by

¹ *Journal of the American Medical Association*. 112:1657-700. April 29, 1939. By permission of the American Medical Association, and through the courtesy of President Hutchins.

juniors in high school. I therefore propose beginning general education at about the beginning of the junior year in high school. Since I abhor the credit system and wish to mark intellectual progress by examinations taken when the student is ready to take them, I shall have no difficulty in admitting younger students to the program if they are ready for it and excluding juniors if they are not.

The course of study that I shall propose is rigorous and prolonged. I think, however, that the ordinary student can complete it in four years. By the ingenious device I have already suggested I shall be able to graduate some students earlier and some later, depending on the ability and industry that they display.

General education should, then, absorb the attention of students between the ages of 15 or 16 and 19 or 20. This is the case in every country of the world but ours. It is the case in some eight or nine places in the United States. Where the high school and the junior college are part of a large city school system, the organization has been successful. Where, as at the University of Chicago and Stephens College, the institution has either a small high school or none at all, the insignificant size of the first two years of the program and the large size of the last two create great difficulties. If you have seventy students entering the four year unit at the junior year in high school and 700 entering at the freshman year in college, it is absurd to talk about a coherent four year program. You must have a curriculum that the 700 can enter in the middle without being handicapped because they did not enter at the beginning.

If in such institutions as my own the scheme I advocate is to succeed, we shall have to convince local parents, at least, that it is wise for them to send their children to us two years earlier than they have been accustomed to sending them. I think that if parents cannot be persuaded to do this the University of Chicago should abandon collegiate work altogether and give up its freshman and sophomore years. Those years at present are a foreign body in the otherwise admirable constitution of the university. The students in them

have different ambitions from those in the divisions above; the teachers have different ambitions, too. But if ties cannot be found for these two years above they must be found below; for I do not believe that two years at any level is long enough to provide an adequate education. It is suggestive that two year units do not exist anywhere else in the world; they are known only in the United States.

I may mention at this point one aspect of the organization of general education which ought to be trivial but in this country is most important. I favor awarding the bachelor's degree in recognition of general education; I favor awarding it at about the end of the sophomore year. This suggestion is not so startling as many people seem to think. President Butler of Columbia advocated it in his annual report for the year 1901-1902. In France the *baccalaureat* is used to indicate the satisfactory completion of general education. The reasons for giving it the same significance here are first that it now has no significance at all. The bachelor's degree means four years in college. As the president of Hiram has lately said, "To most college 'students' who sit long enough and patiently enough and docilely give back a modicum of the wisdom that has flowed past their ears, there will come in time the reward of their long-sitting, sheepskins to cover their intellectual nakedness. . . The usual requirements for graduation, 'a minimum of 120 hours with additional credit for physical education,' may represent little more than hours of painful but patient sitting. Their blood relationship to achievement is so far removed as to make the claimed relationship laughable."

But it is not only the credit system and the examination-by-the-teacher-who-taught-the-course system that make the B. A. certify merely to four years of sitting. It is also and I think principally the fact that the standard four year college of liberal arts is and must be concerned with both general and specialized education. Even in some of the oldest and most conservative of these colleges you will find that the student may indulge in extreme specialization at an early stage.

Yet the preparation with which students enter these colleges is such that the colleges must also give them a general education. These two aims can only confuse the colleges and hence confuse the significance of the degree that they offer.

Columbia, Johns Hopkins, Chicago and several other places have attempted to meet this situation by dividing the first two years from the last two. Some institutions have even given them different staffs and administrations. Here we face again the problems raised by two year units. The first two years is not long enough for general education; the last two is not long enough for advanced study. The remedy would seem to be a four year unit beginning with the junior year in high school and leading to the bachelor's degree, and after that a three year unit beginning with the junior year in college and leading to the master's degree. The bachelor's degree would then indicate an adequate general education and the master's an adequate experience in advanced study. This master's degree should also indicate that the holder is qualified for a teaching position in which research is not expected or required.

The last two years of the present college of liberal arts is left stranded when the college is divided into upper and lower divisions. We have found at Chicago that one of our more difficult problems is how to provide any intelligible plan of advanced study in the junior and senior year. Some of our departments have succeeded in persuading students to plan their courses beginning with the junior year for three years to the master's degree. These departments have been able to effect notable improvements in both the general cultivation and the specific training of their graduates. I recommend the award of the bachelor's degree at the end of the period of general education, that is at about the end of the sophomore year, for the sake of advanced study as much as for the sake of general education.

I may be objected that many students will not want to add a year to their program of advanced study. This in my view is an argument for the plan. The educational system

will be compelled to accommodate the youth of the nation up to the end of the junior college, that is, to about 19 or 20. There is no reason why it should accommodate them after that. Beginning with the junior year, education should be limited to those who are able and willing to profit by it. We should rigorously select our students at the university level, by which I mean the beginning of the junior year. Since, therefore, many students should terminate their education at the end of the sophomore year, one problem is how to induce them to do so. I think they will stay on and, through sheer importunity, get themselves a degree unless they can receive some recognizable and popular insignia at the end of the sophomore year. The bachelor's degree is recognizable and popular. Since it serves no useful purpose at present, I believe it should be made to serve the very useful one of persuading students to get out of education who should not be permitted to remain in it.

If general education is to be given between the beginning of the junior year in high school and the end of the sophomore year in college and if the bachelor's degree is to signify the completion of it, the next question is what is the subject matter that we should expect the student to master in this period to qualify for this degree?

Now I do not hold that general education should be limited to the classics of Greece and Rome. I do not believe that it is possible or desirable to insist that all students who should have a general education must study Greek and Latin. I do hold that tradition is important in education; that the primary purpose of education, indeed, is to help the student understand the intellectual tradition in which he lives. I do not see how he can reach this understanding unless he understands the great books of the western world, beginning with Homer and coming down to our own day. If anybody can suggest a better method of accomplishing the purpose, I shall gladly embrace him and it.

Nor do I hold that the spirit, the philosophy, the technology or the theology of the Middle Ages is important in general education. I have no desire to return to this period any more than I wish to revert to antiquity. Some books written in the Middle Ages seem to me of some consequence to mankind. Most Ph.D.'s have never heard of them. I should like to have all students read some of them. Moreover, medieval scholars did have one insight; they saw that in order to read books you had to know how to do it. They developed the technics of grammar, rhetoric and logic as methods of reading, understanding and talking about things intelligently and intelligibly. I think it cannot be denied that our students in the highest reaches of the university are woefully deficient in all these abilities today. They cannot read, write, speak or think. I do not suggest that we should attempt to introduce the trivium and quadrivium into the American college. I do say that we must try to do for our own students what the seven liberal arts did for the medieval youth. If the Middle Ages have any suggestions to make on this point, we should welcome them. We need all the help we can get.

I should like to remark in passing that in the Middle Ages people went to universities at 13 or 14. They read books and experienced disciplines that are regarded as far too difficult for university professors today. Most of the great books of the western world were written for laymen. Many of them were written for very young laymen. Nothing reveals so clearly the indolence and inertia into which we have fallen as the steady decline in the number of these books read in our schools and colleges and the steady elimination of instruction in the disciplines through which they may be understood. And all this has gone on in the sacred name of liberalizing the curriculum.

The curriculum I favor is not too difficult even for very ordinary American students. It is difficult for the professors but not for the students. And the younger the students are the better they like the books, because they are not old enough

to know that the books are too hard for them to read. Something like the course of study I should favor is now in force at St. John's College, Maryland. There an unselected group of indifferently prepared students are studying these books with tremendous enthusiasm thirty-five hours a week. They read last fall ten dialogues of Plato and voted to have extra classes so that they might read and discuss the rest of them. In connection with the reading, they are going through a formidable course of instruction in grammar, rhetoric, logic and mathematics.

The entire freshman class in Columbia is now reading and discussing twenty-five of the great books in philosophy and literature. I understand that Rushing Week at Columbia was a failure because the students were too interested in the reading to be interested in fraternities, that the books are the chief subject of discussion at all informal student gatherings, and that the only complaint comes from teachers in other courses who feel that their work is suffering from the excitement the books in the Humanities course arouse. For eight years and more I have taught these books to unselected pupils in our University High School and to freshmen, sophomores, juniors and seniors in college. Not one of them has suggested that the books were too hard or that they were not worth reading. I can testify from this experience, though not, of course, very scientifically, that students who can read anything thrive on these books and that the younger they are the more they thrive.

Those who think that this is a barren, arid program, remote from real life and devoid of contemporary interest have either never read the books or do not know how to teach. Or perhaps they have merely forgotten their youth. These books contain what the race regards as the permanent, abiding contributions its intellect and imagination have made. They deal with fundamental questions. It is a mistake to suppose that young people are interested only in football, the dramatic association and the student newspaper. I think it could be proved that these activities have grown to their

present overwhelming importance in proportion as the curriculum has been denatured. Students resort to the extra-curriculum because the curriculum is stupid. Young people are interested in fundamental questions. They are interested in great minds and great works of art. They are, of course, interested in the bearing of these works on the problems of the world today. It is, therefore, impossible to keep out of the discussion, even if the teacher were so fossilized as to want to, the consideration of current events. But these events then take on meaning; the points of difference and the points of similarity between then and now can be presented. Think what a mine of references to what is now going on in the world is Plato's *Republic* or Mill's *Essay on Liberty*. If I had to prescribe an exclusive diet for young Americans, I should rather have them read books like these than gain their political, economic and social orientation by listening to the best radio commentators or absorbing the *New York Times*. Fortunately we do not have to make the choice; they can read the books and listen to the commentators and absorb the *New York Times* too. I repeat: these important agencies of instruction—the radio and the newspaper—and all other experiences of life, as a matter of fact—take on intelligibility as the student comes to understand the tradition in which he lives. Though we have made great advances in technology, so that the steam turbine of last year may not be of much value in understanding the steam turbine of 1939, we must remember that the fundamental questions today are those with which the Greeks were concerned; and the reason is that human nature has not changed. The answers that the Greeks gave are still the answers with which we must begin if we hope to give the right answer today. The answers they gave have affected human history so profoundly that we cannot approach the issue of the purpose of the state, for example, without unconsciously reflecting their views. We may apply to these early thinkers the words of Cardinal Newman about Aristotle: "Do not suppose, that in thus appealing to the ancients, I am throwing back the world two thousand years,

and fettering philosophy with the reasonings of paganism. While the world lasts, will Aristotle's doctrine on these matters last, for he is the oracle of nature and of truth. While we are men, we cannot help, to a great extent, being Aristotelians, for the great Master does but analyze the thoughts, feelings, views, and opinions of human kind. He has told us the meaning of our own words and ideas, before we were born. In many subject-matters, to think correctly, is to think like Aristotle; and we are his disciples whether we will or no, though we may not know it." Do not suppose that in thus including the ancients in my course of study I am excluding the moderns. I do not need to make a case for the moderns. I do apparently need to remind you that the works of the ancients lie at the foundation of the tradition in which we live.

Do not suppose, either, that because I have used as examples the great books in literature, philosophy and the social sciences I am ignoring natural science. The great works in natural science and the great experiments must be a part and an important part of general education. Here again I am not concerned with the method; I am concerned with the end. The student should understand the leading ideas in the natural sciences. Do you think he does today? On the contrary, what he gets today is either a superficial shower from a survey course or professional instruction from the first day of the freshman year, based apparently on the notion that every member of the class is going to be a chemical engineer. General education is not professional education. The curriculum must be designed to prepare the student for intelligent citizenship. The type of scientific instruction that I received in college has no place in the kind of college I am proposing. As for survey courses of the usual variety, they have no place there either. They degenerate too easily into a rapid tour of all the facts known in physics, chemistry and biology. The basis of the scientific program should be the great landmarks of scientific work, the books and the experiments.

Neither at Columbia nor at Chicago has anybody interested in the kind of curriculum I am suggesting had the facilities for the kind of scientific instruction we have wanted to give. At St. John's College those facilities are available and are now being used. It appears that between a half and a third of the course of study will be mathematics and natural science. In fact, St. John's is the only college in the country in which every student must take laboratory science for four years.

Another problem that has disturbed those who have discussed this issue is what books I am going to select to cram down the throats of the young. The answer is that if any reasonably intelligent person will conscientiously try to list the hundred most important books that have ever been written I will accept his list. I feel safe in doing this because (a) the books would all be worth reading and (b) his list would be almost the same as mine. There is, in fact, startling unanimity about what the good books are. The real question is whether they have any place in education. The suggestion that nobody knows what books to select is put forward as an alibi by those who have never read any that would be on anybody's list.

Only one criticism of this program has been made which has seemed to me on the level. That is that students who cannot learn through books will not be able to learn through the course of study that I propose. This, of course, is true. It is what might be called a self-evident proposition. I suggest, however, that we employ this curriculum for students who can be taught to read and that we continue our efforts to discover methods of teaching the rest of the youthful population how to do it. The undisputed fact that some students cannot read any books should not prevent us from giving those who can read *some* the chance to read the best there are.

I could go on here indefinitely discussing the details of this program and the details of the attacks that have been made on it. But these would be details. The real question

is Which side are you on? If you believe that the aim of general education is to teach students to make money; if you believe that the educational system should mirror the chaos of the world; if you think that we have nothing to learn from the past; if you think that the way to prepare students for life is to put them through little fake experiences inside or outside the classroom; if you think that education is information; if you believe that the whims of children should determine what they should study, then I am afraid we can never agree. If, however, you believe that education should train students to think so that they may act intelligently when they face new situations; if you regard it as important for them to understand the tradition in which they live; if you feel that the present educational program leaves something to be desired because of its "progressivism," utilitarianism and diffusion; if you want to open up to the youth of America the treasures of the thought, imagination, and accomplishment of the past, then we can agree, for I shall gladly accept any course of study that will take us even a little way along this road

ARISE, LET US GO HENCE¹

GEORGE B. CUTTEN

President Cutten, of Colgate University, delivered this baccalaureate address before his Colgate students on June 11, 1939. It is a typical speech for such occasions and was well adjusted in general conception and in details to his audience. President Cutten has been in wide demand as a speaker before both educational and business groups. His political philosophy was partly revealed in his Convocation Address, "Robbing the Unborn," given at Colgate on September 21, 1938. On this occasion President Cutten attacked the fiscal program of the present administration as one of "robbing the unborn."

If we want to go anywhere we must start from where we are. Starting from where we wish we were never gets us where we want to be. Let us face facts about our present status, that is our springboard. Perhaps we can evaluate our present assets, in order better to plan our not too easy journey. Many persons are too prone to excuse themselves today by assembling, before the mind's eye, all of their liabilities. We shall not find it necessary to do that—our liabilities will press themselves forward in an endeavor to discourage us, we shall encourage ourselves by emphasizing our assets.

Your most valuable asset is your youth. I know that youth teems with indiscretions and is side-tracked by inexperience, but, after all, it has its irrepressible enthusiasms, its adventurous schemes, and its redundant vigor, assets which time alone can dull, and the passing of the decades alone can erase. If these can be properly harnessed and skillfully guided, the world and its rewards are dangling before you. Youth seems to claim that this is its day and that while old fogies might have been in the way in the past, they must

¹ By permission of the author. Text supplied through the courtesy of President Cutten.

step aside and permit triumphant youth to grasp the wheel. I wonder! Youth has accomplished much but its task is not yet finished.

One of the greatest pieces of oratory ever delivered in English was spoken as long ago as 1741, when the first Earl of Chatham made his famous reply to Horatio Walpole. This belligerent passage began as follows:—"Sir—The atrocious crime of being a young man, which the honorable gentleman has, with such spirit and decency, charged upon me, I shall neither attempt to palliate nor deny, but content myself with wishing that I may be one of those whose follies may cease with my youth, and not of that number who are ignorant in spite of experience."

Pitt was thirty-two years old when he thrilled Parliament with these words. If this charge could be made against him at his age, what might have been said against his illustrious son who entered Parliament at twenty-one, was chancellor of the Exchequer at twenty-three, and became prime minister of England at twenty-five. The astonishment and concern of some of the elders may be gathered from what actually was said when Pitt, the younger, became prime minister:

"A sight to make surrounding nations stare
A kingdom trusted to a school boy's care."

Notwithstanding some indiscretions, he has been called England's greatest prime minister. Earl Canning at twenty-eight was made under secretary of State for foreign affairs, and his father, George Canning, held the same office when twenty-six. Palmerston was secretary of State for war at twenty-five, a position he held for twenty years under six different prime ministers. Gladstone entered Parliament at twenty-one, was first Junior Lord of the Treasury at twenty-three, and a month later became under secretary of State for the colonies, at thirty-one he was in the cabinet.

Some other great youths have made history. Alexander the Great became king when a youth of twenty; at twenty-

wo he gained his first great victory over the Persians; at twenty-three he again defeated them; at twenty-five, with fifty thousand soldiers, he overcame a Persian army of one million. Before his death at the age of thirty-two, he is said to have wept because there were no more worlds to conquer. Napoleon commanded France's army of the interior at twenty-six, and at twenty-seven the army of Italy; at twenty-eight he conquered Austria, and at thirty he was ruler of France. Alexander Hamilton was a lieutenant-colonel on Washington's staff at twenty, father of the Constitution at thirty, and Secretary of the Treasury at thirty-two. James Wolfe was a lieutenant-colonel at twenty-three, hero of Louisburg at thirty-one, and conqueror of Quebec at thirty-two. Clive was described by Pitt as the youth of twenty-seven who has done the deeds of a heaven-born general. Marlborough was a French colonel at twenty-four and an English colonel at twenty-eight. The youngest colonel of the British Army during the Great War was Lieutenant-colonel Eric McDonald of the Canadian Expeditionary Force, who commanded the 10th Alberta Battalion during the last year of the war, when twenty-five.

Hyde became president of Bowdoin at twenty-seven, Frank P. Graves was president of the University of Wyoming at twenty-seven and of Washington at twenty-nine. Robert M. Hutchins was made secretary of Yale at twenty-four, dean of Yale Law School at twenty-eight, and president of the University of Chicago at thirty. At thirty-four, Mark Hopkins became president of Williams, and Clarence Little of the University of Maine; at thirty-seven he was president of Michigan. At thirty-five Eliot went to Harvard, White to Cornell, and Harper to Chicago. The famous Benjamin Silliman became a professor at Yale when only twenty-three.

Among men of letters, Byron published his first volume of poems at nineteen, and the first two cantos of *Childe Harold* at twenty-four; Disraeli published *Viviana Gray* at twenty-two, Dickens published *Pickwick Papers* at twenty-four, and Shelley wrote *Queen Mab* at twenty-one. Noah

Webster published his spelling-book, grammar and reading-book at twenty-five. John T. Delane was editor of the London Times when only twenty-three, and Edward W. Bok was editor of the Ladies Home Journal at twenty-six.

In the field of invention youth has been eminent. George Washington invented the air brake when twenty-two, Luther Burbank produced the potato which bears his name when twenty-two. George Eastman produced dry plates at twenty-six, Alexander Bell invented the telephone when twenty-eight, Henry Ford produced his first motor car at twenty-nine. Thomas Edison invented the incandescent lamp when thirty-two, and the Wright brothers were thirty-two and thirty-six when they made their first flight.

In business we have some early examples of genius. Rudolph Spreckles became president of the Hawaiian Commercial and Sugar Company at twenty-two, and put the plantation on a paying basis within a year. C. S. Woolworth established his first five and ten cent store when twenty-four. John D. Rockefeller organized the Standard Oil Company when thirty-one, and at the same age John Wanamaker opened his department store. The more precocious financial genius of recent years has been S. Parker Gilbert, who became agent general for reparations payments at thirty-two.

This list of eminent youth might be greatly prolonged, but we refrain. I am leaving it to you to add your own names. Waiting for age to sharpen the wits and develop the necessary maturity has ever been a procrastinator's fallacy. The age in which you live is calling for your help now and presenting opportunities in number far in excess of any past age and you cannot ask it to wait. With all the venturesome enthusiasm which your youth provides, force yourselves into the strife, and contribute your strength to accomplish the marvels which your time not only demands, but sorely needs.

There are two other assets which you possess which should be mentioned: these are ability and training. Being loyal Americans, and considering the Declaration of Inde-

pendence as our birth certificate, we have always tried to conform to the pattern of equality. All persons were equal, to be sure, but some persons progressed more rapidly in school, or persevered longer in school, but we gave other reasons for these acts than those of inequality. They did not like school, or they wanted to go to work, or they needed the money, or they could not afford college, or they did not apply themselves; we were finally forced to the conclusion that the underlying reason was that they did not have the ability.

While it seemed like the rankest heresy, we finally came to the conclusion that instead of all persons being equal, there were no two persons equal. Then came the series of tests fostered by the exigencies of war, first those of general intelligence and later those measuring all kinds of abilities and aptitudes, stressing our dissimilarities and emphasizing our differences. The biologist, who had long been trying to show us the effects of heredity and the results of mutations, was finally allowed to speak and to make his contribution; and the sociologist was also given a hearing and permitted to show the effects of social inheritance on the lives of men. Modern science and all forms of modern research have been driving us up and down the scale indicating our differences and inequalities.

Of course, the point is that college students are a selected group, and that a college course is a definite form of intelligence test. When a boy is accepted for college he is thereby assured that he is superior mentally to the majority of his fellows. That does not mean that he is superior to all those who have not attended college, but it does mean that the majority of the people of this country could not, with an unlimited amount of training, pass college entrance examinations. The ability to stay in college shows not only further mental ability, but is a test of the possession of personality traits of a superior quality.

But this superior ability is not all—to develop this each one of you has devoted sixteen years to formal training in

school and college. Probably more than two-thirds of your life up to the present time has been spent in school—only a small proportion of the people of this country have had that advantage, so you are a doubly selected group.

Fortunately, college has meant more to you than just so many studies, and the reading of certain assigned textbooks—much more! There has been the privilege of fine friendships and fellowships, the test of living with and among your fellows, the team play in your games, the individual responsibility of your examinations, the sharpening of wits in your debating, the stimulus of inspiring lecturers, and the fine fellowship with your professors which the College Plan not only permits but encourages. It is difficult to imagine how more of solid training could be crowded into four years, with much of it being absorbed under most agreeable circumstances

It may be nature's stern method, to permit you to know what particular experiences have harmed you in these years, rather than to be able to determine just what experiences have combined to change you from the callow youth of an entering freshman to the realization of manhood which you recognize in yourselves today. While your progress may defy analysis, your evaluation of yourself from year to year, or a comparative estimation of yourselves between now and your graduation from high school, surely shows what training and natural development can accomplish. You leave these halls better endowed, better trained, and better prepared to meet life's vicissitudes that you have ever been before.

Here you stand equipped with youth, ability, and training. Arise, let us go hence! Come on, let's go! But where? Where is hence? What aim have you for yourselves? Are we facing a time devoid of great causes? Are all the great things accomplished, and is the old world burned out? Is youth losing its adventurous spirit? Are young men of today lacking in ambition, Young men are heard talking about a job—any job, but is that adequate?

Is existence all there is to life in these days of the twentieth century? Are we defeated before we start?

You have your strong, well-developed bodies, straining with youthful vigor, but are you content simply to be animals? These bodies have been nourished and exercised and kept healthy to be the servants of human minds. You have your well stored and carefully disciplined minds, capable of guiding these bodies and applying themselves to the problems of life, but are these problems to be purely personal problems, and the intellectual satisfactions to be purely the solution of personal puzzles? These strengths of body and mind must be combined in an harmonious effort to attack and solve the vexing problem of a still higher nature in a larger world. Self is not big enough for your ambitions, and not grand enough for your aims.

There are two questions which intrude themselves very obstinately at this point. In the first place we ask, Have not times changed so that the problems, which were so insistent upon solution centuries or decades ago, have either been solved, or are not longer of interest? A century ago we could not escape them, but what are the great causes today? Might it not have been possible that from the viewpoint of one living in those remote days, the problems were no more apparent than they are to many of us today? Did it not require the trained mind, the far seeing seer, or the practical genius to discover the problem in those days as well as to solve it? Looking back on history the problem did seem apparent, but did it then?

The world has not changed much. it is still looking for the man to supply the minor premise. That is the secret of progress. Everyone knows the general statement contained in the major premise, and everyone can draw the conclusion, but where is the genius to supply the minor premise. For example, everyone knew that matter is composed of small particles, but how much study and research and experiment was necessary and will continue to be necessary to discover that the small particles are electrons and

protons and positons and neutrons and other infinitesimally small bits which form this minute system? The minor premise is not complete yet, but we are working at it. You have learned thousands of general propositions which need solution, they are sticking their fingers in your eyes whichever way you look—the world is asking each one of you, "What about the minor premise?"

When life was simple, problems were simple, and solutions were correspondingly uncomplicated. But with the wide expansion of knowledge, and the ramifications of knowledge spreading into every problem and making it more intricate and entangled, the problem is less clear in its statement and less simple in its solution. Perhaps that is one reason why we do not recognize it more clearly as a problem. There never was a time in the history of the race when more problems are seeking solution and I believe there never was a time when there was a greater opportunity for the trained college man. You may point out the number of people on relief and in the number in C.C.C. Camps, but that means only that these people are removed from competition. The college man with high ideals, a determination to contribute to his generation, trained judgment, and persevering industry is the demand of the hour. He is the man who can administer to a sick world.

There is a second question which naturally comes to you at this point. You say, yes, there are problems and I want to help solve them, but I've already chosen my life's work; must I give this up? Not at all, not at all! Life's most important problems are solved within one's work rather than outside it. The great problems of life are spiritual problems, and spiritual gifts are not confined to monasteries or pulpits. Did not the Saviour of the world work at a carpenter's bench? Suppose you say, "Well, I expect to be a physician, what about that?" If your object in becoming a physician is to make a living out of human suffering, you are bound to fail, regardless of how good a living you make. I wish I could get a glimpse of the book of the

recording angel. I'd just like to get his unbiased opinion of the doctors. I may be wrong, but I believe those marked with A pluses would not be the great city doctors whose names we see in the headlines and who write learned articles in the scientific journals, but some unknown and unsung country doctor who has impressed his spiritual image upon a whole community. No man gets so near to the people as the family doctor, and no one can be more helpful. Have you been reading some of the books recently written by family doctors, such as, "The Horse and Buggy Doctor"? Have you read Lloyd Douglas' "Disputed Passage," then perhaps you know what I mean. If not, then read and reread Ian McLaren's, "The Doctor of the Old School," in "The Bonnie Briar Bush," and you cannot miss the point. There the age old problems were being solved inside of a profession and through its ministrations.

Or perhaps you have decided to be a teacher,—can you make this significant contribution inside this profession or must you give it up? Perhaps I could not do better at this point than to tell you a story. A few years ago there died in Lewiston, Maine, an old man who had been a professor at Bates College for many years. He was followed to his grave by professors, students, janitors, and townspeople unnumbered but all with tear-stained eyes. When a young instructor at Bates he was offered a professorship in a large and important university which, after consideration, he declined. Some of his friends expressed surprise at his action, especially since his salary was so small and the proffered salary was comparatively so large. He replied that after thinking it over he decided that he did not want to take all his pay in money. His reward was in his life's being lived over and over again in the lives of his students, and a few years ago the most important feature of one Commencement was the portrayal of his life and services by some of his former students as a memorial of their affection and esteem. Don't you catch what I mean?

So I might continue. Are you going into law simply because it provides to you the easiest way to make the best living? Then you cannot solve the world's problems, you only increase them. Law presents many opportunities within itself to help when justice reaches above gain, and equity supercedes personal profit. Or perhaps you have chosen to be a preacher of the gospel? Preaching, as such, is terrifically dull and deadening, but if a person instead of preaching has a message from God to deliver to his congregation, a message of help or comfort or inspiration, he then becomes the voice of Jehovah to a bewildered people. It matters little what the profession or business may be if you can present to yourself a spiritual interpretation and recognize yourself as a high priest of that profession ministering to needy men in a needy world. Many men have started out with high ideals and lost them in the scramble, turning real success into apparent success and ending in a glorious failure. College men should be fired with the same glorious enthusiasm for high ideals as possessed the saints and heroes of old. Adventure has not gone out of life and the heroes are not all dead. The world is still holding its crowns of olives before the young men; don't you see them, and can't you discover the paths which lead to them? Perhaps we need a new definition of the heroic but it is still there.

I must not close without pointing to you a young man who lived in Galilee. Life had not been easy for him. He had his ideals, high ideals, which were always being misunderstood and frustrated. He finally came to a place where he saw clearly that carrying out these ideals meant death. This was a situation which he could only meet alone, so he retired to a garden to fight his lonely battle. Everyone had those struggles—should it be the easy way of failure or the hard road which one's ideals demand? He made his decision and joining his companions, said, "Arise, let us go hence." Hence to him was death—yes, death, but hidden in that was life, for he became the most famous, the most copied, the most beloved man who ever lived. I am not

asking you to take your ideals unto death, but to follow them into life. Make them living, vibrating, compelling for yourself, and comforting, inspiring, and helpful to the world.

Gentlemen of Colgate As you go out from Colgate tomorrow, you go deeply in debt You will be in debt to your parents who have sacrificed all the years of your lives, care and time and money, in order that you might be trained and prepared to live a life of usefulness and of worth; you will be in debt to this institution, to its administration, its professorial staff, its students who have been your companions; you will be in debt to the state for its share in your sixteen years of educational training This combined debt will be heavy. I have no doubt but that you have failed to accomplish all which you wished and may feel that you are not competent to repay these debts, and probably that is true. All the balance of this debt may well be forgiven if you will repay one part: the tenacious holding and strenuous effort to fulfil your highest ideals; parents, college, and state must look to you for this payment, the greatest contribution you can return to all three. Your parents, I am sure, will accept this in lieu of all they have done, your college will forgive a few lapses in science or classics, and your state will not murmur if you repay in this coin, for high ideals are the need of this day and the choicest specie in the world's treasury Go forward then, with your feet on the ground, but with your heads in the rarified atmosphere of your highest ideals in order that you may walk the golden path which leads to real victory and success.

RELIGION

JESUS' ETHICAL MESSAGE CONFRONTS THE WORLD¹

HARRY EMERSON FOSDICK

Reverend Harry Emerson Fosdick, of the Riverside Church, New York City, delivered this sermon before his congregation on Sunday morning, February 19, 1939. The present example is to be studied as a sermon. Its theme, homiletical organization, Biblical background and references, oral style, instances of audience adaptation and close reflection of the contemporary world situation, are among the elements to be noted.

John D. Rockefeller, Jr., was so impressed by the sermon that he had 50,000 copies of it distributed among legislators, educators, and business men. In distributing the sermons, to which he gave the title "Dare We Break the Vicious Cycle of Fighting Evil with Evil", he wrote "This sermon is one of the most interesting utterances in connection with the drift of the world toward a great conflagration that has come to my attention." *Time*, July 3, 1939, calls Dr. Fosdick "the most influential preacher in the United States."

For some of us it is easier to believe in the Christian theology than in the Christian ethic. A generation ago many were saying: We cannot believe your Christian ideas of God but the ethical principles of Jesus are the hope of the world. Today, however, it is the ethical principles of Jesus that are difficult. By the Christian ethic I mean no mere ordinary, humane decency, loving those who love us, but rather the radical, sometimes incredible, demands of Jesus that we love our enemies, that if smitten on one cheek we turn the other also or if compelled to go one mile we go two instead, that we do good to those who hate us and pray for those who spitefully use us and persecute us. There is the rub today.

The reason for this is the extraordinary vividness with which a powerful temptation assails us all, the temptation to resist evil with evil. When on the Western prairies a

¹ Reprinted by permission of the author. Text furnished through the courtesy of Dr. Fosdick.

conflagration starts, men fight fire with fire, burning a swath across which the advancing flames cannot leap. What is thus well done in the physical world we are continually tempted to do in the moral world. We fight evil with evil.

In war, if one side uses poison gas, the other side may at first be horrified, but in the end we all succumb. It takes poison gas to fight poison gas. If one side uses conscription, which is of the essence of dictatorship, the other side, being a democracy, at first is shocked, but in the end copies the technique of the enemy. It takes conscription to fight conscription. In personal relationships we are habitually tempted to meet bad temper with bad temper, resentment with resentment, sometimes chicanery with chicanery, and in all this we are morally sustained because we think we are resisting evil—as, indeed, we are, but *with evil*. At that crucial point Jesus parts company with us. It is there that his revolutionary ethic begins.

Listen to him: "How can Satan cast out Satan?" Hidden away in the third chapter of Mark's Gospel that searching question stands, summing up, I think, the essential meaning of Jesus' way of life. "How can Satan cast out Satan?" How can evil be the cure of evil? How can two wrongs make a right? No question could be more pertinent to our modern world, where today violence rises on every side, ill will is rampant, aggressive iniquities must be resisted by good men, and the temptation to fight evil with evil is almost irresistible. Nevertheless, the question of Jesus haunts the Christian conscience and in quiet moments of insight reveals a strange, uncanny common sense—How can Satan cast out Satan?

In the first place, how can the vicious circle of evil answered by more evil, answered by more evil, answered by more evil still, ever be broken unless, somewhere, some one refuses to go on with it? Watch this vicious cycle of wrong answering wrong. Iniquity rises, demanding that we fight back. So, following the pattern of the natural ethic, against which Jesus took his revolutionary stand, we fight bitterness

with bitterness, hatred with hatred, violence with violence, evil growing in a mounting crescendo as wrong answers wrong. This process is afoot everywhere, from international relationships, where they bomb our cities and kill our women and children and so we bomb their cities and kill them, to personal relationships, where we say, He has been unjust—I will show him, I will pay the devil in his own coin.

In this regard how like we human beings are to dogs! For one dog barks and the other barks back and the first barks more loudly and the second becomes more noisy still, in a mounting crescendo of hostility. So one man excused his terrier to the exasperated owner of another. "After all," he said, "the dog is only human."

From the time, as children, we fell into angry name-calling, each trying to lay his tongue to some more stinging epithet, we all have faced this elemental problem, and now that, more mature, we are more dignified, our resentment taking a colder form but remaining still resentment quite unredeemed, who does not know that vicious circle of bitterness answered by bitterness, answered by bitterness again? It is the tragedy of the world!

Shakespeare dramatized this in *Romeo and Juliet*, which, far from being a drama of romantic love alone, is first of all a play about a feud—the house of Capulet against the house of Montague. The first and last words of the play concern the feud, one house against the other, hating each other, meeting violence with violence, evil growing by what it feeds upon and two wrongs never coming out right. Remember Mercutio, slain in the duel and in the insight of his dying moment crying, "A plague o' both your houses!" In the theater one sees people go out before the final scene as though, the love poetry being over, they thought the play was done. Shakespeare would have disliked that. It is the final scene, the climax of the play that he was driving at, where Capulet and Montague stand ashamed and penitent, their long and bitter feud stopped in midcourse by a love that broke the vicious circle of its hate. In that final moment

of the play, when a Christian might kneel as before the mystery of the cross, Capulet says, "O brother Montague, give me thy hand."

So Shakespeare after his own fashion dramatized what the Christian ethic would say, that the world's feud can never end and the vicious circle of wrong answering wrong come to a close until, somewhere, somebody refuses to go on with it. Jesus meant this by his homely saying that if a man is smitten on one cheek he should not smite back, starting thus an endless chain of retaliation. Let him try a new technique! Better, he would say, that one adventure on a revolutionary ethic and, if two blows must be given, take both rather than give one. Let him see if he cannot thus break the endless sequence of fighting evil with evil, whereby we always become the evil that we fight.

This, of course, is what the pacifists at their best are driving at with reference to war. The most shameful aspect of our present international situation, I think, is the way we ape the enemies we hate. The dictatorships say, War! so we say, War! They build vast armaments, so we build vast armaments. Step by step, day by day, we become their yes-men. They say, Dictatorial control of the nation for the sake of war's efficiency! So in Washington we propose bills that provide on the day of war's declaration that the nation shall conscript life, property, labor, conscience. The dictatorships say, Let the War Department determine the foreign policy! So we, too, against the tradition of our people and the very words of our Constitution, say the same thing, and in Washington—witness the proposition for the fortification of Guam—not so much the civilian representatives of the people as the army and the navy begin to initiate, and so ultimately to predetermine, our foreign policy. What apes we are! We copy those we hate. We fight evil with evil and become the evil that we fight. We will conquer them, we say, and so first of all we let them make us in their image. All this we do, thinking Jesus to be a visionary idealist. He is not. His ethic shows a more realistic insight into what is going on in

this modern world than does our boasted hard-headedness. Despite their governments, the people of all the nations in their hearts and homes want peace. Somewhere, sometime, millions of men and women must stand up and cry. We're through; we will not go on forever with war causing more war, causing more war, causing more war still.

If some one says, But we may be compelled to go to war! I ask only that the meaning of that be realistically faced. For in the war you say America is compelled to enter, every cruelty that human beings, implemented with unprecedented instruments, can inflict on human beings will be inflicted. In that terrific wrestling bout no holds will be barred. The word "sacred" will be dropped from the human vocabulary, and neither child nor woman, home, church, school, honor, nor plighted faith will be respected. If we are the apes of our enemies in peace time, in war time we will be apes indeed. Every cruelty they devise we will match. Every devastation they inflict on human beings we will equal. In the end no barbarity will be beneath us. The boys we bore in travail and reared in love in our homes, schools, and churches will become the yes-men of the enemies we fight, in every dastardly deed they do. They will be compelled to. And when it is over, in a world where all agree that no one can really win a war, with civilization, it may be, wrecked, with a thousand new problems raised for every one solved and countless hatreds engendered for every one satisfied, I can think of only one factor that still will stand quite unimpaired: namely, the strange man of Galilee whom many call a visionary idealist still asking with infinite sorrow, "How can Satan cast out Satan?"

Let us take a further step and note that whether or not this principle of Jesus that evil is not to be fought with evil appeals to us, depends primarily on what it is that most of all we want. Do we really want to cast out Satan? Do we most of all desire to get rid of the evil of the world? Multitudes of people want something else altogether—their own prestige, personal or national, their gain and profit, their

vengeance even or their private conquest. Of course, to such Jesus' ethic is preposterous. We cannot see his meaning truly any more than we can see the windows of a Gothic cathedral until we go inside, and from within his life understand what most of all he wanted. Above all else he wanted to rid the world of its evil. Whatever it cost, whether it brought him to the cross or no, somehow to rid the world of its evil was his passionate desire. If *that* is what a man wants, then evil is not an instrument to use. It is only in the light of this supreme aim and motive of Jesus that one can see his ethical principles as reasonable. If one wants most of all to cast out Satan, then an alliance with Satan is no means to that end.

Translate this into personal life and its truth is clear. A man does a wrong to us; what do we want? It may be that our first impetuous desire turns to vindictiveness—an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth. So one man I know of had an enemy. For years financially he laid for him until he got him, sold him out, lock, stock and barrel, house and furniture, and, with a satisfaction which only the vindictive know, cried, "My God! but that's conquering!" If a man wants *that*, then Jesus' ethic is preposterous.

When, however, a man did Jesus a wrong, Jesus felt concern for the man. There are different ways in which one can intimate the presence of need and none more unmistakable than to be unfair, unjust, ungenerous. When a man does a wrong it is as though he flew unwittingly a flag of distress and uttered a cry for help. Evil-doing may be variously interpreted. It may cry to us, Revenge! It may say, Ignore me! It may say, S.O.S.; there is a need to be met, a deep want in this man's life, an evil that by goodwill, perchance, you may help to cure. So, when the Samaritan villagers used Jesus spitefully, he was sorry for the villagers. When Judas betrayed him, he was heartbroken because he could not help Judas. It was the wrong-heartedness itself he wanted to get rid of, the unkindness and bitterness he wished to banish from the earth. When one takes the measure of

this supreme motive, Jesus' ethic becomes not preposterous but inevitable. Satan cannot cast out Satan.

If some one says that this ethic is risky, that it is bound to cost sacrifice and when used on some people is sure to fail, I answer, Of course it is. During the last blizzard, we are told, a woman living on a branch of the Ohio saw a poor dog drifting on the ice-floes and, touched with pity, ran to the stream, with difficulty launched her boat, fought for two hours before she reached the dog and brought him safely back. Then he bit her and she died of rabies. There are human curs like that. Of all men in history, do you think Jesus did not know it? But he would say, I think, Take it any way you will, human life is risky; you cannot avoid risk in life, and the salvation of the world depends on men and women who will take *this* risk, to face ill will with goodwill, to try to break the vicious circle of evil's sequence, where wrong answers wrong, and when two blows must be given to take both rather than give one.

If we say, In certain personal relationships this ethic can be made to work and it was only of these individual relationships that Jesus was thinking, I suspect that shows how little we know about Jesus' world. He was not tucked off in a forgotten corner of the earth. He lived on one of the major highways of the Roman Empire. Every breath of news, I suspect, from the Thames to the Euphrates soon or late came to Nazareth. He lived in a violent generation when force ruled the world and might made right as terribly as it does today. He lived in a nation seething with violent revolt. He dealt not only with Saducees, compromising with Rome; not only with Pharisees, waiting for their supernatural Messiah to come from heaven and redeem them, but with Zealots, fiery, militant, revolutionary rebels, crying out for bloodshed to make right their heinous wrongs. This public situation, so dreadfully like ours, Jesus had in mind when he turned his back on revenge and bloodshed and based his ministry on undiscourageable goodwill.

It was this public situation he faced in the temptation at the beginning of his ministry, when the devil, as it were, showed him all the kingdoms of the earth and said, "All these things will I give thee, if thou wilt fall down and worship me." How perennial a temptation that is! How terribly it assails us all today! To join forces with the devil to beat the devil, to fight evil with evil—ah, Christ, how did you resist the pressure of it in your time and how in a world like this do you expect us to follow you?

Yet when in calmer moments one faces the facts, one wonders if he is not right. Satan cannot cast out Satan. All history is a running commentary on that. The means determine the end. Everlastingly that is true—the means determine the end. We of all generations should understand that. Did we not fight a war to make the world safe for democracy? We were resisting evil. We prided ourselves on that. We were morally indignant against a real wrong and sacrificially devoted to a holy cause. We would make the world safe for democracy. Conscription to make the world safe for democracy! Poison gas, bombing of open cities, blockades that starved millions, to make the world safe for democracy! Dictatorial control of the whole nation's life—even of what we ate and wore—the very suspension of the Bill of Rights, to make the world safe for democracy! And in the end a treaty, the only kind of treaty modern war can issue in—vengeful, selfish, cruel—to make the world safe for democracy! So we woke up to find the world less safe for democracy than it had been in generations. We discovered that war, being essentially totalitarian and dictatorial, cannot defend democracy, but that the means determine the end. Ah, Christ, you are not a visionary idealist; you are the sanest realist of us all. Satan cannot cast out Satan.

Let us take a further step and note the positive power of this ethic when it is put to work. For it is not weak, as the average man thinks, but very strong. Of all ridiculous beatitudes, some would say, the most incredible is the one where

Jesus sums this ethic up and the faith on which it is built: "Blessed are the meek: for they shall inherit the earth." What nonsense! says the average man. Yet would you stake your credit upon the opposite? Blessed are the Hitlers for they shall inherit the earth! Would you? Grant him every temporary victory you think possible. Would you say that in the long run he will inherit the earth? I know no intelligent person who thinks that. All history rises up against that. Like children's sand houses built upon the shore, age after age the tides of destiny have risen and wiped out the empires built on force. Of all contrasts in history none could be more disproportionate than that between the Roman Empire on one side and Calvary's cross upon the other. Yet the Roman Empire has fallen and many another empire since, like children's blocks toppling in a row, but still that cross stands and haunts the conscience of the world. So I think Jesus sat many a day upon the hills above Nazareth and looked across the plain of Esdraelon, stretching mile after mile before his gaze. There the historic battles of the world had been fought. There the empires of the Euphrates and the Nile had clashed. Age after age violence had met violence and kings and pharaohs had fallen in futility, and Satan had never cast out Satan yet. It was from that vision, not first of an ideal but of the facts, that Jesus went out, I think, determined, though he died for it, to introduce into the world a new and revolutionary ethic—meet ill will with goodwill, dare to break the vicious circle of evil answering evil, never fight wrong with wrong. Satan cannot cast out Satan.

This does not mean that all use of force is satanic. Coercion has its proper place in life, always indicating a pathological condition but capable of salutary use in the interests of the whole community, as, for example, against the insane or the criminal. Even in such realms, however, the Christian ethic has been so far influential that not retaliation but cure and reformation have become the test and aim of intelligent procedure. Because one believes in municipal police one is

not by any logic driven, as some seem to suppose, to believe in war. War is a highly specialized form of force, in its preparations, procedures and results distinguishable from any other of force's exhibitions. One may believe in the police and think dueling wrong; one may grant the salutary nature of coercion communally applied for the good of all and still think gladiatorial shows are unmitigated and outmoded evil. So one may pray and work for an ultimate international community, in which the collective security of all is the aim of all, and the policing of the world is the joint affair of all, and may still see clearly that at the present moment no war will mean that or anything aimed in that direction, but will be the old satanic, retaliatory process, motivated by imperialistic ambitions and waged with sadistic savagery to an end catastrophically evil. War is satanic and only Satan has anything to gain from it.

However some may doubt the possibility of applying this principle to public affairs, how can one doubt its magisterial power in personal relationships? I would almost venture to say that any special fineness of spirit that anybody here possesses is his because sometime he has lived at the receiving end of this ethical principle. For there are three kinds of goodness in the world. First, coerced goodness, where some one is good to us because we can require it. That is not impressive. Then there is deserved goodness, where we have been good to some one and now, *quid pro quo*, so much for so much, he is good to us. That is not deeply impressive. Then there is undeserved goodness, where we have been unworthy, ungenerous, unkind, unjust, and, lo! some one comes back at us with goodwill and friendliness. From the days at home when our parents so treated us, through all our lives, no force has reached so deep, laid hold so hard, lifted so powerfully as that. Thank God not everybody has slapped back at us! Thank God some people did go the second mile with us! The salvation of the world depends on the multiplication of people who understand and practise that adventurous ethic.

Do not represent me as having said that it is simple to apply this principle to the world's large affairs. It is desperately difficult. No one of us is wise enough to see around the next corner. Only as Americans this seems clear, that we are at the fork of the road and that either we are going to throw the vast influence of this nation on the side of those constructive forces that make for international goodwill and conference instead of violence or else we are in for an era dominated by our aping of our enemies. They make war! We make war! They build vast armaments! We build vast armaments! They use poison gas! We use poison gas! They say, All restrictions off on the most brutal instincts of mankind! We say the same, until once more, fighting evil with evil until we are the evil that we fight, far from conquering our enemies we let them make us after their own image. So at long last, at the end of a ruinous era, we shall be facing again the question—which God grant us grace to face now before it is too late—"How can Satan cast out Satan?"

BRIDGES INTO A BETTER WORLD¹

CHARLES W GILKEY

Reverend Charles W. Gilkey delivered this sermon at the regular Sunday morning service at the Riverside Church, New York, on Sunday, November 27th, 1938. He also gave it as a baccalaureate address in the chapel at the University of Chicago, and elsewhere.

Reverend Gilkey has been Professor of Preaching at the University of Chicago Divinity School since 1916, Dean of the University Chapel since 1928, and more recently, Associate Dean of the Divinity School.

The George Washington Bridge across the Hudson river from upper Manhattan Island to the New Jersey shore was until 1937 the longest single suspension bridge-span ever built. But its leap of 3,500 feet across the Hudson has now been surpassed by the 4,200-foot span of the bridge at San Francisco across the Golden Gate. Forty-two hundred feet is practically four-fifths of a mile. When the Brooklyn Bridge across the East river was completed fifty-five years ago, its span of 1,600 feet was one of the wonders of the nineteenth century—and rightly so. But within the last fifty years two factors have combined to make it possible to increase by more than two and a half times the length of a suspension bridge across open water. One of these is, of course, the greater exactness and confidence of the engineering that plans the bridge. The other, of which we think more especially today, is the improvement in the quality of the materials available for its construction.

A friend in Minneapolis who first aroused my own interest in these matters some months ago told me that he understood that if the George Washington Bridge had been built of the old ordinary steel that was the only kind available

¹ Reprinted from the *Christian Century Pulpit*, 10 no 6.132-6 June, 1939. Text furnished through the courtesy of Dr Gilkey.

when the Brooklyn Bridge was built, it might have collapsed by its own weight before any traffic crossed it. This seemed to me so surprising a statement that I asked a neighbor of mine who makes steel what he thought about it. His answer was that, not being an engineer, he could not say as to the possible collapse of the new bridges had they been made of the old steel; but he did know that the new alloy steels were at least twice as strong as the old ordinary steel, and that this had been a large factor in making possible the lengthening of bridges without sacrificing their carrying power. He suggested that I check the matter with the steel company which in its third generation still bears the name of the engineer who designed the Brooklyn Bridge, whose successors have made the steel and spun the cables for most of the great suspension bridges on the American continent ever since.

Their Chicago representative sent me an elaborate table giving the comparative statistics of the Brooklyn, the George Washington and the Golden Gate bridges. In answer to my question, he said he thought the suggestion that the new bridges might have collapsed had they been made of the old steel was doubtless an exaggeration; but he added that there could be no question that the development of the new high tensile alloy steels, lighter in weight, smaller in bulk, but stronger in carrying power, had been a main factor in making it possible to bridge the Hudson river and the Golden Gate.

A visitor to New York can see the truth of this for himself if he takes the time first to walk across the Brooklyn Bridge, and notes that what is massive there is the two granite towers and the four huge cables which they swing across the East river. If then he visits the George Washington Bridge, he sees at once that what is massive there is the anchorage of the bridge to the solid rock on either side, at the heart of Manhattan Island and at the foundations of the New Jersey Palisades. In sharp contrast, the towers which soar more than 600 feet above the Hudson on either bank are made of skeleton steel; and the cables which they swing

200 feet above the river and 3,500 feet across seem, relatively to the height of the towers and the length of the bridge, almost as slender as a spider's web. Lighter but stronger!

Now we did not have to have these new bridges across the Hudson river and the Golden Gate. For three centuries the original Dutch settlers and their successors on Manhattan Island made their way across the Hudson by other means. For more than a hundred years white men and red men crossed the Golden Gate in boats. Of course, it is very convenient to step into a motor car and whisk in a couple of minutes across a body of water that only yesterday required fifteen to thirty minutes for its crossing; but our civilization would have endured and prospered without these newer bridges. Convenient as they are, they are not essential to our human future.

In our post-war human world, however, the gaps and gulfs between different nations and races and classes of men have before our anxious eyes been widening as if by a succession of social earthquakes. Our generation stands on the edge of these gulfs with the uneasy realization that unless we can bridge them, the future of our civilization is precarious. The gaps that divide nation from nation and race from race have within our lifetime been widened and deepened by prejudice, suspicion and fear. Within our own country different sections and groups, and what even in America we begin ominously to call classes, find it more difficult to understand one another. The critical issue for our civilization has become the social and spiritual question whether we can bridge these widening human gulfs.

A second spiritual problem that has become almost as urgent within our own lifetime is the question whether we can as individuals carry the increasing load of life in a time of insecurity and uncertainty. One of the outstanding bridge designers of his generation tells his friends that he has spent the second half of his professional career reconstructing the bridges which he himself designed during its first half. The

reason for this is that the strains upon these earlier bridges have been greatly increased. Locomotives are heavier than they used to be, and trains longer. Automobiles may not weigh as much individually, but there are many more of them; and trucks have greatly increased both in number and in weight. Most of us have discovered in our own personal experience of late, the spiritual analogue to this engineering problem. The burden of life has been greatly increased for us during these last ten years of uncertainty and insecurity. All around us neighbors who for whatever reason have not "got what it takes" to carry the increasing load of life in such a time, crack up in physical or nervous breakdown, or let themselves and those dependent on them down. It is not only the social problems of our troubled time that create its anxieties; it is the heavier burden of life itself.

And bridges do go down. Within the memory of many of us, the first attempt to bridge the St. Lawrence at Quebec collapsed into the river before it was finished. A few weeks ago at the University of Virginia I talked with a member of the faculty who with his own eyes saw that bridge go down. When I asked him whether the defect lay in bad design or bad materials, he said that both had contributed to the disaster. Since my friend in Minneapolis first got me interested in suspension bridges and the new steels, the bridge over the Niagara river, from which for forty years thousands of honeymooning couples have had their best view of Niagara Falls, went down in February 1938, under the pounding of ice cakes at its foundations, and it lies today a twisted mass of rusty wreckage at the bottom of the gorge. Is that to be the fate of our boasted civilization? Will spectators on the edge of the gorge of history centuries hence, pointing back to the remnants of our social structure, say of us that in spite of the science and education, the democracy and progress of which we have been so proud, our early twentieth century lacked something that proved essential for the bridging of our social divisions and the maintenance of our interdependent life?

I do not know the answer to that question. I suspect that no living person knows it. The point of this sermon is simply that if as individuals and as a generation we are to meet these two critical problems of our time, we must follow the example set us by the engineers who have bridged the Hudson river and the Golden Gate. We must produce a quality of life like these new steels: lighter in weight, smaller in bulk, but stronger in carrying power.

I

We need this, first, in our *democracy*. A century and more ago Thomas Jefferson declared that American democracy would survive and prosper just so long as America was a country of small farmers, each owning and operating his own farm. But within a hundred years social forces stronger than his foresight or our control have carried us as a nation out from that prairie land of quarter-sections which seemed to him the native soil of democracy, into this hill country, so like the mountains of Kentucky and Tennessee, wherein our modern life is set. Here are deep and widening divides between groups and classes, sections and races, to be bridged; and floods every now and then which threaten to sweep our present bridges away. Can our democracy build these indispensable bridges long enough and strong enough to span the gulfs and carry the loads of our stormy time?

Our own generation has awakened within the last few years to a new sense of its trusteeship for the democracy which our fathers entrusted to us. Finding democracy suddenly under world-wide challenge and strain as it has never been before within our lifetime, we are easily tempted to think that the simple reinforcement of the old structure by new laws and agencies and gadgets will secure democracy against breakdown. The fate of the bridges at Quebec and Niagara may help us to realize that the mere addition of masses of new legislation at Washington and Springfield, and successive inquisitions into the patriotism of our neigh-

bors, will hardly suffice for such a time. Overbuilt bridges break down of their own weight if they are not radically reconstructed to carry their new loads, and built out of improved materials like the new steels.

Democracy in America during the next generation will sorely need a new quality of understanding and devotion on the part of the generation to which this graduating class belongs; an attitude and a spirit, particularly in all relations with races and groups and points of view other than our own, which have the lightness and strength of the new steels. The best social thinking of our own time is realizing that democracy is not simply a form of government or an elaborate structure of political machinery: it is rather a *way of life*, carried out into all human relations. That way of life must be produced by individuals who have caught its spirit and undertaken its responsibilities. They will be the stronger human material out of which the social order of the better future must be built.

II

We need this, second, in our *ethics*. Our generation is discovering, when it begins to think seriously about democracy, that the issues that undergird democracy reach out and down into ethical questions that concern the relation of men to their fellows, and of all social groups to other groups. The complacent optimism of the pre-war generation, with its naive confidence in human nature and social progress, took it for granted that these issues were simple and easy, that man could jump the gaps that separate him from the good life and the better world, as boys jump brooks with a run and a leap. But our post-war generation, realizing the deep gulfs within human nature itself that divide its ideals from its achievements, and the wide chasms between what Reinhold Niebuhr has called "moral man and immoral society," stands a bit breathless on the edge of deeper ethical issues and ethical tasks than its lighthearted predecessors realized.

If for a moment we look back across the long history of man's attempt to reach the good life and build his social ideals into actualities, we cannot miss the fact that over and over again he has tried to do this by adding rule to rule and ban to ban, in a legalistic code that became at last so top-heavy that finally it collapsed by its own weight. The Hindus did this long ago, and the Jews in their time; our own Puritan forefathers tried it yet once more. But each time the same thing happened. Sometimes through the sheer overweight of its elaborate legalism, but more often through a change in the traffic of life itself that put upon the old codes burdens they could not carry, the whole structure went down. Something like that has been happening in our own time to those whose sense of right and wrong has been built chiefly of traditional rules and prohibitions. No need to tell a student audience how many such crackups and breakdowns in conventional morality have been and still are happening all about us. There are those in every college community who in such a time toss their hats into the air and shout, "Hurrah! the rules are off, and we can do as we please. There is neither right nor wrong any longer to bother about." It is worth noting that the attitude which stops with emancipation and irresponsibility as the last word on the edge of a great gulf, never yet built a bridge to the other side—and never will!

It is still more worth noting that these very periods of breakdown in traditional and conventional morality have often been those in which great ethical pioneers have led humanity forward to something deeper and better than the old codes. It was in such a time that the prophet Amos said to his contemporaries, "Let justice roll down as rivers, and righteousness as a mighty stream." It was in such a time that a greater than Amos said to his friends, "Except your righteousness shall *exceed* the righteousness of the scribes and the Pharisees, ye shall in no case enter into the Kingdom of Heaven." The scribes and Pharisees were the rule-makers and the code-builders of their time—and their legalisms col-

lapsed long ago. But Jesus gave men through the way of life which he himself put into practice an attitude and a spirit lighter and smaller but stronger than any code; out of that way of life the bridges into a better world must be built.

Aldous Huxley's *Ends and Means* is a modern application of that same insight, calling upon the individual and the small group to develop the "love and awareness" which are the "primary virtues" for an interdependent world like ours. Jesus' saying in the Sermon on the Mount is therefore the natural text for this baccalaureate sermon, addressed with new urgency to a generation that has to build bridges into a better world: "Except your righteousness shall *exceed* the righteousness of the scribes and the Pharisees, ye shall in no case enter into the Kingdom of Heaven."

III

We need this, finally, in our *religion*. Our generation begins to realize that the deeper issues of democracy reach down through ethics into religion. What kind of universe is this? What are the enduring values it produces and preserves? In the pre-war days of confidence when, to borrow Norman Thomas' happy figure, we took it for granted that progress was a ramp on which humanity had only to keep moving in order to keep rising, we can see now that it was little wonder that men's sense of need for religion tended to lessen. But we shall not understand the newer and deeper religious trends of our own time until we realize that mankind today is catching its breath on the edge of a chasm like the Grand Canyon in its breadth and depth, and is asking whether its social hopes and faiths lie forever beyond its reach on that other shore. Religion within our own lifetime has recovered the sense of this great gulf between the achievements of man and the purposes of God; and we shall not ourselves understand some of its most characteristic aspects until our own awareness of that gulf is awakened.

The effort of religion to bridge that gulf has often in human history taken the form of the elaboration of dogmas into a more and more complicated creed. And in religion with its creed-building, as in ethics with its code-making, the historical result has usually been the same. Sometimes through the sheer overbuilding of the dogmatic structure, but more often through some change in the traffic of human life itself, that put on it burdens which it could not sustain, the old creed went down. The sound of such theological crack-ups and breakdowns is a familiar one in every student community. Many of you Seniors must have heard it often among your classmates—and very likely within yourselves! In most college communities there are some students and professors who in such a case are disposed to throw their hats into the air, saying, "Hurrah! Religion is *through*, and we need not bother about it any more." It is worth noting, again, that this attitude which stops emancipation and irresponsibility has no more bridged the gulf which religion senses between man and God, or solved the problem of man's relation to his universe and of the relation of our own generation to history and the future, than the same attitude would ever have bridged the Hudson river or the Golden Gate.

It is further worth noting that these same periods of theological breakdown have often been periods of great advance for intelligent and vital religion. It was in such a time that the prophet Micah said to his fellows, "What doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God?" There is a religion lighter in its dogmatic structure, and smaller in its ecclesiastical bulk, but stronger in its ethical and spiritual carrying power. And a greater than Micah told his contemporaries in another period of collapsing creeds, that the whole law was fulfilled in love to man and love to God. There it is again: lighter, but stronger.

It is also worth noting, in a time when some current theologies are telling us that God is inaccessible to our

human outreach, upon another shore to which we cannot make our way, and when some current philosophies are telling us that man stands alone in the universe upon this shore of our human experience and limitations, with Nothing Beyond in which to put faith or hope—that the Christian faith in God and in man is anchored, like the George Washington Bridge, on *both sides*. The Christian religion assures us that in spite of man's folly and greed and sin, God is never beyond our human outreach when we seek him with all our hearts. It assures us likewise that in spite of our human failures, there are in us capacities and values about which God cares so much that he will not let us go. Our Christian faith is, therefore, anchored not in man alone on this side of our human experience, nor yet in God alone on the other side: but in their hope and faith and love each for the other.

The difficulty is, of course, if we are honest with ourselves and with one another, that we have not got "what it takes" to live in times like these. But we who live in Chicago see every night upon our southeastern sky a parable of encouragement, which I should like to leave with you finally, to be remembered whenever the sky looks dark and the horizon lurid. After every sunset, when the steel mills are running in South Chicago and Gary, we can see in the southeast, against the blackness, the flares of furnaces heated seven times hotter than furnaces were ever heated before. How like the dark and lurid times in which our life is cast! But out of those same furnaces come the new steels.

These steels are not found in nature. You cannot dig them up ready-made in the Mesaba range or the Pennsylvania mountains. But the *makings* of them are among the commonest metals in nature. The iron ore which provides their chief ingredient comes aboard ore ships down Lake Michigan, red with rust and full of sand and slag and stone. How like our human nature with its weaknesses and imperfections! That human nature, as we ourselves start out on the voyage of life with it, does not provide us ready-made

"what it takes" to live in times like these. But it does provide us with the "makings."

The new steels are not a simple product; they are an alloy with many ingredients, some common and some rare. When men rise to tell us that all our age needs is better education, or more intelligence, or a different social order, or a new administration in Washington—or any other of the panaceas offered for our problems—I am reminded of the new steels. It will take most and possibly all of these things in combination. Into that combination must enter more intelligence, and better education, and a better social order—but into it must enter also personal awareness, imagination, sympathy, good will, courage, patience, faith, hope, love. So, at least, the new steels have come into being!

Once upon a time there was a man whose name has become synonymous with misfortune. Our younger generation is not so familiar with the great drama of his sufferings and perplexities that is one of the noblest books of the Old Testament, as were some earlier generations, and that is our loss, both literary and spiritual. In the twenty-third chapter of the book that bears his name, Job lifts his sorely tried faith to his Creator: "When he hath tried me, I shall come forth as *gold*."

Our generation—and especially our younger generation—would never have had the nerve to say that. We know only too well that we are not made of any such precious metal. Our prayer would be a simpler and a humbler one: "When he hath tried *us*, may we come forth as *steel*."

LIBERTY AND THE REPUBLIC ¹

FULTON J. SHEEN

This sermon, the eighth in a series of sixteen addresses entitled *Freedom*, was delivered in the Catholic Hour on February 19, 1939, by Right Rev. Msgr. Fulton J. Sheen, of the Catholic University of America. The Catholic Hour, initiated in 1930 by the National Broadcasting Company, was sponsored by the National Council of Catholic Men. Father Sheen was the first speaker on this program and has contributed a series of sermons each year since. *The Catholic World* wrote editorially concerning him: "By his radio sermons and by his books, as well as by his lectures in this country and abroad, Msgr. Sheen has become one of the best known priests in the English speaking world." (*Catholic World*, 139: p. 619. August, 1934.)

Patriotism is rapidly becoming a lost virtue; too many of our citizens think of freedom only as the right to make a speech; of tolerance only as indifference to right and wrong; of liberalism only as the surrender of tradition, constitutions, and the value of a person; and of democracy as only the catchword with which to involve American interests in international brigandry.

Love of country needs once more to be revived, otherwise we shall perish for no other crime than because we refused to love. Patriotism has a negative aspect and a positive aspect and one cannot be divorced from the other. Negatively, patriotism implies for us strong opposition to all anti-American activities; positively, patriotism requires that we be so grateful to God for the blessings that we enjoy in America that we dedicate our lives to preserve those blessings to the end.

From the first point of view, if we are to maintain Americanism, we must remember that there are not two, but *three* anti-American ideologies: Communism, Nazism

¹ By permission of the author. The text was furnished through the courtesy of Right Rev. Msgr. Fulton J. Sheen.

and Fascism. The distinction between the three to an American is like the distinction between theft, burglary, and larceny. Every true American knows that he cannot be pro-Communist, or pro-Nazi, or pro-Fascist without being anti-American. But the problem is, how to know whether an organization is Communist, Fascist, or Nazi? The answer is very simple: a truly American organization is opposed to all three. Hence any organization which condemns one without condemning the others is, to say the least, suspect.

If a given organization, parading as patriotic and peace-loving, is not a stooge for the Nazi, Fascist or Communist powers, then let it be patriotic enough to condemn all anti-American activities, if it says it is immoral for Mussolini to set up a Fascist state in Abyssinia, and it is immoral for Hitler to set up a Nazi state in Austria, then let it also admit that it is immoral for Stalin to set up a Soviet state in America. Only those who condemn persecution and tyranny irrespective of where they find it have any moral right to be heard.

The Communist tactics in the United States can be made clear by a parable. One day a dozen rats got into a house and ate cheese, meat, ham, and crackers. The housewife set traps and caught six of the rats. The other six remaining rats organized a popular front with a rat trap salesman and told him to tell the lady of the house that her greatest danger was not rats but bed-bugs; another popular front was organized with professors, who told the housewife that statistics proved that 60% of children in the village of Padaowski lost their fingers in rat traps in one year; finally the rats organized a popular front with some sentimentally inclined social leaders who told the housewife that by using rat-traps she was guilty of the reactionary crime of "rat-baiting." The poor housewife, so overcome by such influential nit-wits, gave up the use of rat-traps entirely—and now the rats run the pantry.

The moral is obvious. Communism creates the bogey of Fascism in order that it may work unmolested, as Fascism

creates the bogey of Communism. Which comes first? Historically, Communism comes first, as it did in Italy, in Germany. There would be no Mussolini or Hitler in the world today if there had been no Communism, just as there would be no rat-traps if there were no rats. If Americans want to keep Fascism out of America, and we all do, then the best thing for us to do is to keep out Communism which generates it by force of reaction. To this end 18 governments in Europe have outlawed the Communist party. Both Fascism and Communism are founded on the bogey of fear—one on the fear of the "Red terror" the other on the fear of Fascism. Whether or not we fall prey to either depends upon our gullibility; and, curiously enough, those who have been most taken in by the Communist propaganda in the United States are not the workers, or the poor, but the "intelligentsia," that is, those who think they know but do not know that they don't. It is easier to get a university professor to join a Communist front organization than it is to get an unemployed father. We are supposed to be an alert and intelligent people, but the Communist front organizations prove that many Americans can be taken in hook, line, and sinker and maneuvered not only into defending Communist interests throughout the world but also into assisting them to create the situation they desire for the successful culmination of their revolutionary strategy.

To all United Fronts of Nazism, Fascism, and Communism let ring in patriotic hearts the language of the President of the United States. "If another form of government can present a United Front in its attacks on democracy, the attack must be met by democracy. Such a democracy can and must exist in the United States." To all these propagandists we say: If you believe that Communism, Nazism, and Fascism are better than Americanism, then go back to Stalin, Hitler, and Mussolini; if you do not, then for the love of God's truth, stop propagandizing about them and let us live in peace!

But patriotism is not just a negation of anti-American activities; it is above all the affirmation of a love of country as a reflection of our love of God. When the roof leaks the householder may become so concerned with its repair as to forget the happiness of himself and his family under that roof. So it is with America. Because our national structure has such economic leaks as unemployment and dust storms we are apt to concentrate so much on their repair as to forget the joys of living in the house called America. It is about time we stopped talking about our aches and pains and began to think of the happiness of being Americans.

Consider some of the blessings that we in the United States enjoy. *Economically* we are better off than any nation in the world. The laboring man in the United States has a right to strike in protest against unjust wages, hours, and working conditions. Russia forbids the strike under Article 131, classifying it as sabotage for which death is often the penalty. The Italian Law of April 3, 1926, the German Labor Act of January 1934, agrees with Russia in the refusal to grant the worker this basic right. In Italy the per capita bank deposit is \$47.; in Germany \$89.; in Russia \$9.50; in America \$423. In Italy there are 30 gallons of milk available per person, per year; in Russia 35; and in the United States 95. In Italy there are available in units of electricity 275 kilowat hours per person; in Germany 550; in Russia 190; in the United States 900. If the people in those countries packed up and moved by auto tomorrow, how many would have to walk? In Italy, for one that would ride, twenty would walk; in Germany for one that would ride, ten would walk; in Russia for one that would ride, 150 would walk; and in the United States there are enough cars for *all* to ride. In Italy there is one telephone for every 120 people; in Germany one for every 20; in Russia one for every 280; and in the United States one for every ten.

Politically we have much to be thankful for. Note the difference between American and the Totalitarian regimes:

Here in America, man is the source of rights; in Italy the state is the source, in Russia the class, and in Germany the race. Here the state exists for man, there man exists for the state. Here the state recognizes inalienable human rights; there the state grants them—and since it gives man rights it can also take them away. Here the Government is distinct from the Party; there the Government *is* the Party, which means there is no right of dissent. Here freedom resides in man; there freedom resides in the collectivity—in the race as in Germany, in the nation as in Italy, and in the class as in Russia. Here a man can render to God the things that are God's, and to Caesar the things that are Caesar's. There, they say, even God derives His existence and authority from Caesar. Here a Communist or Nazi or Fascist may attack the government openly or undermine it from within; there they would be shot for the same offense. Here even the anti-American survives; there only the servile exist. Here the moral conscience exists independently of the state conscience; there the moral conscience is abolished for the collective conscience. Here a man has personal value apart from the mass; there he is a drop of blood in a race or a cog in a machine or a soldier in an army. For this blessing above all others we should get down on our knees every day and thank God we are Americans.

We should be thankful also for our *religious* blessings and the right to adore God according to the dictates of our conscience. A democracy cannot survive without religion. Once it surrenders a belief in God as the source of right as our Declaration of Independence affirms, then the state sets itself up as a source of rights and liberties. But if the state gives rights, then the state can take them away, and that is the end of democracy. So true is this that Russia, which has outlawed God, has also outlawed inalienable human rights, with Germany a close second. These states know they cannot possess man body and soul until they dispossess religion which says the soul belongs not to the state, but to man and to God. It might be well to mention

here that the grave danger facing civilization is the possible future union of Germany and Russia. Their political ideologies are somewhat different, though not very, for Germany is like a half-cooked beefsteak, brown on the outside but red on the inside. They have this in common. they both hate religion. That hate is so basic that it dwarfs other differences of a political or economic character. Let not this be thought an idle fear. It has happened before. Pilate and Herod were mortal enemies until they could both condemn the torn and bleeding Christ, so Hitler and Stalin who are enemies now may yet embrace and unite for the same unholy cause to drive God from the earth He has made. The elements of a battle between brotherhood in God and comradeship in anti-God already exist in germ in the present world situation. When it comes then shall the loyalties of men be tested; then shall men feel in their hearts the deep and hidden thrill of what is only now a catchword. "For God and country" There is no escaping this truth and let us deeply engrave it in our minds: The denial of the soul is the beginning of all tyranny and dictatorship.

But religion is necessary for still another reason. A democracy assumes that citizens will always be for justice, righteousness, and virtue, and that in exercising the right of suffrage, citizens will always choose good men and good policies, and never bad men and evil policies. Justice, righteousness and virtue are inseparable from a conscience and a conscience is inseparable from a moral law, and a moral law is inseparable from a Law Maker whose nature is Goodness. Let religion die out of the hearts of citizens and the virtues essential for democracy die with it. What then? Then democracy will mean the right to choose what is wicked and immoral; then right will mean not what is truly right but only what is popular. With all our talk about democracy let us not forget that it is possible for a democracy to vote itself out of democracy. The result of such surrender of religion and abandonment to popular fronts of foreign ideologies will be chaos and enthroned injustice.

To restore some kind of order the state will then have to impose its own idea of religion on the people, and that is the beginning of tyranny. The non-religious state becomes the anti-religious state; the anti-religious state becomes the persecuting state

Let us not forget that there are two kinds of tyrannies: not only the tyranny of the minority, as in Russia where only 2% of the population belong to the Communist Party and control the other 98%, but also the tyranny of the majority. One can be just as bad as the other. A democracy that loses religion can be just as intolerant to its minorities as a dictatorship which loses religion. Only so long as men love justice will they be just; let devotion to a class, or a party ideology, or a false liberalism become the substitute for justice, and you surrender the belief in the sovereign, inalienable rights of man, which are the foundation of the American republic.

It is in religious education, whether it be Jewish, Protestant, or Catholic, that the hope of America lies, for religion and the rights of men go hand in hand. Religion and tyranny grow in inverse ratio. The anti-religious states are the anti-human states. Man will always have an object of worship, and if he forgets the true God someone will forge him a new deity either of the race, or the nation, or the class. Nabuchodonosor of old not only demanded that his statue be adored, but that at a given signal the adorations of other gods should cease. Modern Nabuchodonosors in Germany and Russia have trumpeted the same command: "Render unto Caesar even the things that are God's." May we resist that philosophy and keep both our religion and our republic so that free men may always have the full right proclaimed by Our Lord to "render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's and unto God the things that are God's."

The decline of patriotism in America is due to a decline of religion. As men cease to love God, they also cease to love their neighbor. No one proves this better than Matthew,

the author of the first Gospel. He was at one time as unpatriotic a citizen as ever lived: his land was over-run by a foreign power, his fellow-citizens lost many of their civil and political rights—and yet he welcomed the foreign power to his bosom for the basest of all motives, financial booty. He became a publican, that is a collector for the Romans, thus not only selling out his countrymen, but even filching them to enrich himself by becoming subject to the invaders. One day while collecting his taxes and counting his profits, Our Divine Savior passed by. "Come, follow Me," He said to Matthew, and Matthew with no other promise than a peace which shown in the Divine Countenance became an apostle, an evangelist, and a martyr. He became more than that—the greatest patriot in the Gospels. His Gospel might be called the Gospel of Patriotism. Tireless he becomes in unfolding the glories of his people, the traditions of his land, and the prophecies of its spiritual triumphs. Time and time again he goes back to the past, turns over the pages of Isaias, Jeremias, Micheas, David, and the Kings; ninety-nine times to be exact, he quotes from the glorious pages of his people, and crowns it all with the thrilling message. You are a great people! From Israel comes the Savior, from our clouds comes the Messiah; from our earth the Redeemer. Hail! Christ is your king

He became a patriot because he found his God. May we all go and do likewise.

BIOGRAPHICAL NOTES ¹

BARKLEY, ALBEN WILLIAM (1877-). Born in Graves County, Kentucky; A.B., Marvin College, Kentucky, 1897; Studied at Emory College, and the University of Virginia Law School; practiced law since 1901; member of the Sixty-third to the Sixty-ninth Congress, 1913-1927; United States Senator since 1927; reelected Senator in 1939 after a strenuous primary campaign against A. B. Chandler, of Kentucky; Senate Leader of the Administration Party in the Seventy-sixth Congress

BORAH, WILLIAM EDGAR (1865-). Born in Fairfield, Illinois; educated at Southern Illinois Academy, University of Kansas; practiced law at Lyons, Kansas, 1890-1891, Boise, Idaho, since 1891; United States Senator from Idaho since 1907; Chairman of Senate Foreign Relations Committee since 1924; member of the Judiciary Committee and the Education and Labor Committee; opposed entrance of the United States to League of Nations and World Court, active during the first Session of the Seventy-sixth Congress in criticising the foreign policy of the Roosevelt Administration

BUTLER, NICHOLAS MURRAY (1862-). Born in Elizabeth, New Jersey, A.B., Columbia, 1882, A.M., 1883, Ph.D., 1884; honorary degrees from many American and European Universities; President of Columbia since 1902; frequently a delegate to the Republican National Conventions; received Republican electoral vote for Vice-president of the United States, 1913; received 69½ votes from New York State as candidate for President of the United States, Republican National Convention, 1920; member or Chairman of many committees, associations, and foundations for the

¹ The chief source of these notes is *Who's Who in America*.

advancement of education; awarded one-half of Nobel peace prize, 1931; President of Carnegie Endowment for International Peace since 1925; author of *The Meaning of Education*, 1898, *Philosophy*, 1911, *A World in Ferment*, 1918, *Looking Forward*, 1932, and numerous other books, essays, and addresses on subjects relating to philosophy, education, government, and international relations

CLARK, BENNETT CHAMP (1890-). Born in Bowling Green, Missouri; A.B., University of Missouri, 1913; LL.B., George Washington University, 1914; Parliamentarian, United States House of Representatives, 1913-1917; admitted to Missouri bar, 1914; Lieutenant Colonel United States Infantry 1917-1918; appointed United States Senator, 1933; elected to the Senate for the term beginning 1939; author: *John Quincy Adams*, 1932.

CUTTEN, GEORGE BARTON (1874-). Born in Canada; B.A., Acadia University, 1896, M.A., 1897; A.B. Yale 1897, Ph.D., 1902, B.D., 1903; D.D., Colgate, McMaster; LL.D., Acadia; ordained in the Baptist ministry, 1897; President of Colgate University since 1922; officer in the Canadian Expeditionary Force; author: *Mind, Its Origin and Goal*, 1925; *The Threat of Leisure*, 1926; and other books.

DAY, EDMUND EZRA (1883-). Holds degrees from Dartmouth, Harvard, University of Vermont; Instructor in Economics, Dartmouth, 1907-10; Instructor, Assistant Professor, and Professor of Economics, Harvard, 1910-23; University of Michigan, 1923-27; with the Rockefeller Foundation since 1928 as Director of Social Science; United States Representative on the Preparatory Commission of Experts for World Monetary and Economic Conference, 1932-33; Director of Social Sciences for the General Education Board since 1930; President of Cornell University since 1937.

DEWEY, THOMAS EDMUND (1902-). Born in Owosso, Michigan; A.B., University of Michigan, 1923

LL B., Columbia, 1925, began practicing law in New York City in 1926; special assistant to United States Attorney General, 1934-35; special prosecutor, racket and vice investigation, New York, 1935-37; elected District Attorney, New York County, 1937; Republican candidate for Governor of New York, 1938, defeated by Governor Lehman by some 70,000 votes (See also *Representative American Speeches* 1937-38, p 163)

EASTMAN, JOSEPH BARTLETT (1882-). B.A., Amherst College, 1904, LL.D., 1926, LL.D., Temple and Syracuse Universities, 1934, Secretary, Public Franchise League of Boston, 1906-13, counsel for the employees of various street railway companies in wage arbitration cases, 1913-1914, member of the Massachusetts Public Service Commission, 1915-1919; member of the Interstate Commerce Commission since 1919, appointed Federal Coordinator of Transportation, June, 1933.

FOSDICK, HARRY EMERSON (1878-) Born in Buffalo, New York, A.B., Colgate, 1900, D.D., 1914, B.D., Union Theological Seminary, 1904, A.M., Columbia, 1908; honorary degrees from New York University, Brown University, Glasgow (Scotland) University, and other institutions; was ordained to the Baptist ministry in 1903; instructor of homiletics, 1908-1915, Professor of Practical Theology since 1915, Union Theological Seminary; pastor of Riverside Church, New York City; author of *Christianity and Progress*, 1922, *As I See Religion*, 1932, *Successful Christian Living*, 1937; and numerous other books of a religious nature

GILKEY, CHARLES WHITNEY (1882-). A.B., Harvard, 1903, A.M., 1904; B.D., Union Theological Seminary, 1908, Universities of Berlin, Marburg, 1908-1909, United Free Church College, Glasgow, New College, Edinburgh, Oxford University, 1909-1910; D.D. from various colleges and universities, including Williams, Yale, Brown, Harvard; Hyde Park Baptist Church in Chicago, 1910-1928; Professor of Preaching at the University of Chicago Divinity School,

and Dean of the University Chapel since 1928; recently made Associate Dean of the Divinity School; University preacher at Harvard, Yale, Princeton, Cornell, and other universities; author of *Barrows Lectures—Jesus and Our Generation*, 1925, *New Frontiers for Faith*, 1926 and other religious publications.

HILLMAN, SIDNEY (1887-) Born in Zagare, Lithuania, came to the United States at the age of twenty; rabbinical education; with Hart, Schaffner, and Marks, 1911-14; employee of the Cloakmakers Union, 1914; President of the Amalgamated Clothing Makers of America since 1915; prominent in the organization of labor activities; member of the Labor Advisory Board, NRA, 1933; National Industrial Recovery Board, 1935; his organization joined the C.I.O.; appointed by President John Lewis of the C.I.O. to negotiate for peace with the A.F. of L., 1939

HUGHES, CHARLES EVANS (1862-). Born in Glens Falls, New York; A.B., Brown University, 1881, A.M., 1884, LL.B., Columbia, 1884; LL.D. from Brown University, Yale University, Harvard University, and other institutions; Dr., *honoris causa*, University of Brussels and University of Louvain, 1924; practiced law, New York, 1884-1891, 1893-1906; special lecturer on law, Cornell University, 1893-1895, New York Law School, 1893-1895; Governor of New York, 1907-1910; became Associate Justice of United States Supreme Court, 1910; Republican candidate for the Presidency of the United States, 1916; appointed Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court, 1930; author of *The Pathway of Peace, and Other Addresses*, 1925, *Pan-American Peace Plans* (Yale University lectures), 1929, and other books on jurisprudence, government, and foreign relations. (See also *Representative American Speeches*, 1937-38, p. 176.)

HULL, CORDELL (1871-). Attended National Normal University, Lebanon, Ohio; B.L., Cumberland Univer-

sity Law School, 1891; LL D. at various universities including Notre Dame, George Washington, Columbia, University of Michigan; admitted to the Tennessee bar, 1891; Circuit Judge, Tennessee, 1903-07, member of House of Representatives, 1917-1921, 1923-31; elected United States Senator from Tennessee for the term 1931-1937; appointed Secretary of State, 1933, and reappointed, 1937; Chairman of the American Delegation, Monetary and Economic Conference, London, 1933; Chairman of the American Delegation, Seventh International Conference of American States, Montevideo, 1933, and of the Eighth International Conference of American States, Lima, Peru, 1938; author of *Federal Income Tax System of 1913*, and *Federal Inheritance Act of 1916*.

HUTCHINS, ROBERT MAYNARD (1899-). Born in Brooklyn, New York; A.B., Yale, 1921, honorary A.M., 1922, LL.B., 1925; LL.D. from West Virginia University, Lafayette College, and other institutions; Dean of Yale Law School, 1928-1929; President of the University of Chicago since 1929; author of numerous articles on American education.

KALTENBORN, HANS V. (1878-). Born in Milwaukee, Wisconsin. A.B., *cum laude*, Harvard, 1909; reporter, *Brooklyn Eagle*, 1902-1905; *Brooklyn (New York) Eagle*, 1910-1930 as dramatic editor, editorial writer, assistant managing editor, associate editor; radio news analyst since 1922; news editor of the Columbia Broadcasting System since 1930; radio reporter, Republican and Democratic Conventions, summer, 1932, London Economic Conference, summer, 1933, League of Nations, Geneva, 1935; author of *We Look at the World*, 1930, *I Broadcast the Crisis*, 1938.

LEE, JOSHUA BRYAN (1892-). Born in Alabama. A.B., University of Oklahoma, 1917; M.A., Columbia, 1924; LL.B., Cumberland University, 1925; teacher of public

speaking, University of Oklahoma, 1917-1934, member of the Seventy-fourth Congress, 1935-37, Fifth Oklahoma District; United States Senator representing Oklahoma since 1937, private in the United States Army, fourteen months in France, World War; author *Soldier Rhymes*, 1919, *Public Speaking Manual*, 1924.

MILLIKAN, ROBERT ANDREWS (1868-). Born in Morrison, Illinois, A.B., Oberlin, 1891, A.M., 1893; Ph.D. Columbia, 1895; studied at the Berlin and Göttingen, 1895-1896, honorary degrees at Oberlin, Northwestern, Pennsylvania, Columbia, and many other colleges and universities; Professor of Physics, University of Chicago, 1896-1921, at the California Institute of Technology since 1921, Commissioned Lieutenant, Signal Corps, U.S.A., 1917, many prizes for research in electricity and physics, including the Nobel prize in physics, 1923; author of many scientific works including *Elements of Physics*, 1917, *Science and Life*, 1923, *Evolution of Science and Religion*, 1927, *A First Course in Physics for Colleges*, 1930, *Science in the New Civilization*, 1930, *Time, Matter and Values*, 1932.

MURPHY, FRANK (1893-). Born at Harbor Beach, Michigan; LL.B., University of Michigan, 1914, graduate study, Lincoln's Inn, London and Trinity College, Dublin; in practice of law, Detroit, Michigan since 1916; Instructor in Law, University of Detroit, 1922-1927; Mayor of Detroit, 1930-1933; Governor General of the Philippine Islands, 1933-1935; United States Commissioner to the Philippines, 1935-36; Governor of Michigan, 1937-39; involved in the problem of the "sit-down strike" in Michigan, 1937; after his defeat for the reelection of Governor of Michigan, appointed Attorney General of the United States, 1939.

NYE, GERALD P. (1892-). Born in Hortonville, Wisconsin; publisher of *The Review*, Hortonville, 1911; manager and editor of *Daily Plain Dealer*, Creston, Iowa,

1915; became editor and manager of *Griggs County Sentinel-Courier*, 1919; United States Senator from North Dakota since 1925.

ROOSEVELT, FRANKLIN DELANO (1882-). Born in Hyde Park, New York; A.B., Harvard, 1904; attended Columbia University Law School, 1904-1907, honorary degrees from Rutgers, Yale, Notre Dame, and other institutions, began practicing law in New York, 1907; Assistant Secretary of the Navy, 1913-1920; Governor of New York from 1929-1933; has been President of the United States since 1933; Author of *Whither Bound*, 1926, *Looking Forward*, 1933, *Political Papers*, 1938, and other books; recognized as one of the foremost speakers in America.

SHEEN, FULTON JOHN (1895-). Born, El Paso, Illinois; A.B., St Viatore College, 1917, A.M., 1919; St. Paul Seminary, 1919, S.T.B. and J.C.B., Catholic University of America, 1920; Ph.D. Louvain University, 1923; B.D. Rome, 1924; honorary degrees from Marquette, Loyola, and other colleges and universities; member of faculty, Catholic University of America since 1926, author of *God and Intelligence*, 1925, *Divine Immanence*, 1931, *The Way of the Cross*, 1932, *The Eternal Galilean*, 1934, and the *Mystical Body of Christ*, 1935, and other publications

SMITH, THOMAS VERNOR (1890-). Born in Blanket, Texas; A.B. degree, University of Texas, 1915; M.A., University of Chicago, 1916, Ph.D., 1922, Professor, Texas Christian University, 1916-1918, University of Texas, 1919-1921, and professor of Philosophy at the University of Chicago since 1928; editor of the *Internasional Journal of Ethics*; member of the Illinois Senate, 1935-38; chairman of the Illinois Legislative Council, 1937-38; a private in the United States Army, 1918-1919, elected to the Seventy-sixth Congress from the State at large, 1938; author of *The Democratic Way of Life*, 1925, *The Philosophic Way of Life*, 1929, *The Promise of American Politics*, 1936, and other books.

TAFT, ROBERT ALPHONSO (1889-). Born in Cincinnati, Ohio; attended public schools of Cincinnati and the Taft School; was graduated from Yale University, A B, 1910; Harvard University LL B, 1913; attorney at law, Assistant Counsel for the United States Food Administration, 1917-1918, Counsel for the American Relief Administration, 1919; member of the Ohio House of Representatives, 1921-1926, Speaker in 1926; Ohio State Senate, 1931-32; elected to the United States Senate on November 8, 1938, for the term ending January 3, 1945

THOMPSON, DOROTHY (Mrs. Sinclair Lewis). (1894-). Born in Lancaster, New York, A.B., Syracuse University, 1914, graduate study at the University of Vienna, speaker in up-state New York Woman Suffrage Campaign, 1915-1917; foreign correspondent for Philadelphia *Public Ledger* and New York *Evening Post*, 1920-1928, Chief of Central European Service, 1924-28; member of American Academy of Political and Social Science; author of *The New Russia*, *I Saw Hitler*, and *Political Guide*; popular radio commentator; contributor to American and British reviews

TUGWELL, REXFORD GUY (1891-) Born, Sinclairville, New York, B.S. in Economics, Wharton School of Finance and Commerce, University of Pennsylvania, 1915, A.M. 1916, Ph.D., 1922; Professor of Economics, University of Pennsylvania, 1916-1917; Assistant Professor, University of Washington, 1917-1918, manager of the American University Union, Europe, 1918, Instructor in Economics, Columbia, 1920-22, Assistant Professor, 1922-26, Associate Professor, 1926-31, Professor since 1931; Assistant Secretary, United States Department of Agriculture, 1933, Under Secretary of Agriculture, 1934-1937; private business since 1937; Chairman of the Planning Board of New York City since 1937; author of *The Economic Basis of Public Interest*, 1922, *American Economic Life*, 1925, *Industry's Coming of Age*, 1927, *Battle for Democracy*, 1935, and many other books and articles.

INDEX

- Administration of justice, speeches concerning, 161-83
- Agriculture, decline in income of, 146, need for government support of, 156
- Agriculture, Industry, and Labor*, Hillman, Sidney, 142-57
- Air forces, military, in Germany, 67-68, in the United States, 71
- Alliances, avoidance of by America, 54-55
- Americanism, contrasted with Communism, Nazism, Fascism, 245-46
- American foreign policy, speeches concerning, 25-76
- America's Town Hall Meeting of the Air, 138
- Amos, quoted, 240
- Analysis, a factor in a good speech, 5
- Arise, Let Us Go Hence*, Cutten, George B., 210-20
- Armaments, necessity for in the United States, 37
- Bachelor's degree, at the end of the second year in college, 201, as a terminal degree, 202-03
- Barkley, Alben W. *The Foreign Policies of Roosevelt*, 53-59, biographical note concerning, 253
- Bill of Rights, 178
- Biographical notes, 253-60
- Buenos Aires, inter-American conference at, 43
- Bodily action, 5
- Borah, William B. *Possible Results of a European War*, 29-35, biographical note concerning, 253
- Bridges into a better World*, Gilkey, Charles W., 234-44
- Butler, Nicholas Murray, *Why War?* 13-17; biographical note concerning, 253
- Canada, political relation of to the United States, 25-28, protection of by the United States, 27
- Canadian Position of the United States*, Roosevelt, Franklin D., 25-28
- Capital, draft of. See *Wealth*.
- Checks and balances, 164, 68
- Chicago, University of, plan of education, 202
- Civilization, international character of, 26
- Civilian Conservation Corps, 67
- Civil Liberties*, Murphy, Frank, 173-80
- Civil liberty, need for, 174, curtailment of through Alien and Sedition Acts, 175; infringement of, since 1929, 176-77, embodiment of in Bill of Rights, 178, embodiment of in Fourteenth Amendment, 178; relation of to the Criminal Division of the Department of Justice, 179, support of by public opinion, 179-80
- Clark, Bennett Champ, *Rearmament*, 71-76, biographical note concerning, 254
- Classification of speeches, 5
- Clothing industry, collective bargaining in, 150-51. See also *Collective Bargaining*
- Collective bargaining, success of, 150; method of, 153
- College students, ability of, 214, educational program of, 214, friendships of, 215; opportunities for, 216-20
- Communism, in America, 246, age of, 247, anti-religious character of, 247-49
- Compton, Karl, quoted, 190-92
- Conferences, inter-American, at Montevideo, 41, at Buenos Aires, 43
- Confidence, business, 117
- Congress, achievements of for 150 years, 162, relation of to executive branch, 162
- Consumer-buying power, a basis of prosperity, 98, increase of through government spending, 100
- Corporation undistributed earnings tax, repeal of, 104-05
- Courts, relation of to other branches of government, 164, and civil liberties, 179
- Criticism of speeches, standards of, 5
- Curran, John, quoted, 177
- Cutten, George B. *Arise, Let us go Hence*, 210-20, biographical note concerning, 254
- Czechoslovakia Capitulates*, Kaltenborn, H. V., 18-21
- Daladier, Premier, as defender of democracy, 84
- Day, Edmund E. *What Really Threatens American Democracy?* 79-86; biographical note concerning, 254

- Debt, Federal, size of, 30, relation of to Federal investments, 103, relation of to increasing national income, 106, prospects of decreasing, 106
- Delivery, bodily action and, 5, personality and, 5, projection in, 5, voice and, 5
- Democracy, public speaking and, 7, and propaganda, speeches concerning, 79-93, dangers to from European invasion, 79-80, from a European war, 81; from European propaganda, 81, from modern science and technology, 81, program for conservation of, 82, dangers to from political corruption, 82, dangers to from bad leadership, 83, and resort to force, 84, dangers to from lack of social unity and discipline, 85, dependence of on tolerance, 85, essentials of, 163, need for strengthening of, 173, 238, a way of life, 239
- Democratic Party, relation of to corporate centralism, 119-25, promoter of social security, 125, opposition of to Republican corporate fascism, 127, reliance of on power of the whole people to curb corporations, 128, identification of with New Federalism, 128, and program of decentralization, 128
- Department of Agriculture, quoted, 148
- Department of Justice, Criminal Division of, 179
- Depression, of 1933, 136, of 1937, 136, of 1929, 146
- Dewey, Thomas E. *The Hines Policy-Numbers Case*, 181-83, biographical note concerning, 254-55
- Dictatorships, no danger to America from European, 80, in relation to American democracy, 81
- Dictatorial control, in opposition to Christian ethic, 226
- Discussion, relation of to propaganda, 89
- Dole, condemnation of, 102
- Drafting of Wealth in Time of War*, Lee, Joshua Bryan, 60-64
- Eastman, Joseph B. *How Can We Solve the Railroad Problem?* 138-41, biographical note concerning, 255
- Economic and social problems, speeches concerning, 97-157
- Education, speeches concerning, 199-220, general, 200, relationship of to bachelor's degree, 201, relationship of to upper and lower divisions, 202, subject matter of 203, at the University of Chicago, 203, at St. John's College, 205, discussion method of, 206, relation of to study of natural sciences, 207
- Ethic, Christian, a program of brotherhood, 223-24, opposition of to dictatorial methods, 226, opposition of to war, 227, strength, sources of, 230
- Fascism, relation of to democracy, 81, 245-46
- For an Adequate National Defense*, Nye, G. P., Jr., 65-70
- For a Third Term*, Tugwell, Rexford Guy, 166-72
- Foreign policies of Roosevelt See Roosevelt, F. D.
- Foreign Policies of Roosevelt, The*, Barkley, Alben W., 53-59
- Foreign policy, American, vagueness of, 68
- Forward America A Debate*, Smith, T. V., and Taft, Robert A., 119-37
- Forms of support in speech-making, 5
- Fosdick, Harry Emerson, *Jesus' Ethical Message Confronts the World*, 223-33, biographical note concerning, 255
- Gilkey, Charles W. *Bridges Into a Better World*, 234-44, biographical note concerning, 255
- Government, speeches concerning, 161-83, achievements of in American Federal system, 162, relation of to state government, 163; relation of to individual liberty, 164, relation of to rights of minorities, 164; relation of to judicial branch, 164
- Great Britain, a supporter of Hitler, 33, a supporter of Japan in Manchuria, 33, a backer of Germany in Austria, 34, a party to the dismemberment of Czechoslovakia, 34
- Greek civilization, contribution of to modern education, 206
- Guffey Coal Act, 135
- Hillman, Sidney, *Agriculture, Industry, and Labor*, 142-57, biographical note concerning, 256
- Hines Policy-Numbers Case, The*, Dewey, Thomas E., 181-83
- Hitler, support of in England, 33
- How Can We Solve the Railroad Problem?* Eastman, Joseph B., 138-41
- Hughes, Charles E. *The 150th Anniversary of the First Congress*, 161-65, biographical note concerning, 256
- Hull, Cordell, *The Opening of the Pan American Conference*, 40-52, biographical note concerning, 256-57

Hutchins, Robert M. *The Organization and Subject Matter of General Education*, 199-209; biographical note concerning, 257

Imperialism, British, 74

Individual liberty, relation of to Congress, 164, and the courts, 164

Industrial democracy, success of, 152

See also Clothing Industry

Industrial expansion, decline of, 147

Invasion, danger of, 79-80

Jefferson, an advocate of constitutional changes, 54; in opposition to strong government, 54

Jesus, quoted, 223, 224, 231, 241, 252

Jesus' Ethical Message Confronts the World, Fosdick, Harry Emerson, 223-33

Job, quoted, 244

Kaltenborn, H. V. *Czechoslovakia Capitulates*, 18-21, biographical note concerning, 257

Kellogg, F. B., on the Pact of Paris, 57

Latin America, and representative government, 45; and races, 45, and the spirit of tolerance, 45, and international law, 45, and threats from Europe, 47; and desire for peace, 48; and need for measures of protection, 49; and Pan-American conferences, 49-50, removal of trade barriers in, 50, promotion of disarmaments in, 50-51

Labor and capital, unity of, 192

Labor losses, 144, 146

Leadership, for peace, 16

Lee, Joshua B. *Drafting of Wealth in Time of War*, 60-64, *Technological Unemployment and Relief*, 108-18; biographical note concerning, 257-8

Liberty, defense of, 168

Liberty and the Republic, Sheen, Fulton J., 245-52

Micah, quoted, 242

Middle Ages, education in, 204

Millikan, Robert A. *Science and the World Tomorrow*, 187-93, biographical note concerning, 258

Monopoly, abuses of, 125-28, 134

Munich, conference of, 18; settlement of, 19; effect of settlement of, 20

Murphy, Frank, *Civil Liberties*, 173-80, biographical note concerning, 258

National budget, prospects for balancing, 106

National Defense, demand for, 65; adequate provisions for, 66; justification for, in defending British and French imperialism, 73; against European attack, 80

National income, decline in, 43; factors in, 147

Nazism, 245-46

Neutrality law, adequacy of, 66, attempts to discredit, 66

New Deal Must Continue, The Roosevelt, Franklin D., 97-107

New Deal, an agency of collectivism, 131, an agency of governmental regulation, 132; failure of to reduce unemployment, 133, a sponsor of government controlled monopolies, 134

New Federalism, explanation of, 12

Newman, Cardinal, quoted, 206

Nine Power Treaty, 57

Nye, G. P., Jr. *For an Adequate Defense*, 65-70; biographical note concerning, 258-59

Oklahoma, unemployment in, 109

Opening of the Pan-American Conference, The, Hull, Cordell, 40-5
Organization and Subject Matter of General Education, Hutchins, Robert M., 199-209

Organization, a factor in a good speech, 5

Organizations, objections to from labor, farmers, retailers, 121, dangers of, 122, Republican party supporter of, 124; Democratic party and control of, 125

One hundred and Fiftieth Anniversary of the First Congress, Hughes, Charles E., 161-65

Pan-American Conference, at Lima, 49-50, cause of, 48-50, and the promotion of peace, 49; and promotion of international law, 49; and removal of trade barriers, 50; and promotion of disarmaments, 50-51

Patriotism, decline of, 245, relation of to Communism, Nazism, Fascism, 246-48; relation of to love of country, 248

Peace, conditions of, 36-37

Peace, relationship of, to sanctity of treaties, 37

Persuasion, a factor in good speaking, 5

- Possible Results of a European War*, Borah, W. E., 29-35
- Propaganda, dangers of, from Europe, 81; rise of, 87-88, in Germany, 88; in democracies, 89; favorable types of, 90, need for tracing sources of, 91-2, anti-Semitic, 92
- Prague, and the Munich settlement, 21
- Presidency, direct responsibility of to the people, 169, limitations of power of, by Senate, 170, inertia of during Second Term, 171
- Projection, a factor in delivery, 5
- Prosperity, dependence of on circulation of currency, 114, relation of to distribution of wealth, 117
- Purchasing power, need for increasing in America, 149
- Railroads, financial plight of, 138, causes of plight of, 138-39; competition against, 139, debts of, 139; need of to provide service, 140; need of to keep down rates, 140; need of to improve equipment, 140, need of to eliminate wastes, 140, need of to limit wages, 140-41, government aid for, 141
- Rearmament, Clark, Bennett Champ, 71-76
- Recovery, economic, through co-operation of agriculture, labor, and industry, 145-50
- Religion, speeches concerning, 223-52; need for strengthening, 241-42; a supporter of democracy, 249, a foe of political tyranny, 251
- Republican Party, opponent of NRA, 133; supporter of business competition, 134; supporter of wider distribution of incomes, 134, opponent of strong governmental control of agriculture, labor, industry, 135
- Romeo and Juliet, cited, 225-26
- Roosevelt, F. D. *The Canadian Position of the United States*, 25-28, *The United States Policy Toward War*, 36-39; *The New Deal Must Continue*, 97-107; biographical note concerning, 259; opposition of to entangling alliances, 55; a supporter of world trade, 56; a supporter of limited armaments, 57, a supporter of international social independence, 57, a supporter of the Monroe Doctrine, 58-59
- Schuschnigg, abandonment of by France and England, 34
- Science, speeches concerning, 187-97; progress of, 187-88, power machines and the advancement of, 189, benefits of to labor, 193; air travel and, 194, communication and, 194, public health and, 195; social and political change and, 195
- Science and the World Tomorrow*, Millikan, Robert A., 187-93
- Senate, conservatism of, 169
- St. John's College, curriculum of, 205
- Sheen, Fulton J. *Liberty and the Republic*, 245-52; biographical note concerning, 259
- Speech, types of, 3; illustrations of, 4, characteristics of a good, 5; standards for criticizing, 5
- Smith, T. V. and Taft, Robert A.; *Forward America A Debate*, 119-37; biographical notes concerning, 259-60
- South America, programs of for peace, 49-50
- Spanish-American War, aims of, 54
- Spending, governmental, to promote consumer-purchasing, 100
- Stopping Propaganda*, Dorothy Thompson, 87-93
- Taft, Robert A. *Forward America: A Debate*, 119-37; biographical note concerning, 260
- Taxes, Federal, no decrease of, 104; no increase of from consumers, 104, adjustment of in levy on undistributed earnings of corporations, 104
- Technological Unemployment and Relief*, Lee, Joshua Bryan, 108-18
- Texts, authenticity of, 4
- Third-term, traditional objection to, 167, "moral" objection to, 167; advantages of, 169-70, need for, 170
- Thompson, Dorothy, *Stopping Propaganda*, 87-93, biographical note concerning, 260
- Tolerance, progress in, 175
- Trade barriers, removal of, 50
- Treaty, for limitations of armaments, 57
- Truth, need for in political world, 90
- Tugwell, Rexford Guy, *For a Third Term*, 166-72, biographical note concerning, 260
- Unemployment, amount of, 30; relation of to labor-saving inventions, 109, old age pensions and youth administrations a partial cure for, 111; concentration of wealth a cause of, 111, the WPA a partial cure for, 113, distribution of wealth a cure for, 117

- United States Policy Toward War, The*, Roosevelt, F. D., 36-39
- United States, as agent for peace, 16-17, unemployment in, 30; debt of, 30, economic advantages of, 248, political blessings of, 248, religious freedom in, 249. *See also* National Defense
- Voice, importance of in speech-making, 5
- Wages, losses of through depressions, 144-46
- Wagner Act, 135
- War and peace, speeches concerning, 13-21
- War, causes of, 13; cure of through the people, 15, devastation of next, 15; prevention of, 16; results of, to United States, 30-31; difficulties of financing by Germany, 61; financing of by the United States, 62; a denial of Christian ethic 227, 232.
- Washington, George, on entangling alliances, 54
- Why War?* Butler, Nicholas Murray, 13-17
- Wealth, draft of in war time, 61; financing war through, 61; securing national support through 63; in the United States, 112; maldistribution of in the United States, 148
- What Really Threatens American Democracy?* Day, Edmund E., 79-86
- Works Progress Administration, 111
- World war, results of, 32; financing of, 62

THE HANDBOOK SERIES

This series includes a number of subjects on public questions on which every man and woman should be well informed. The reprints are grouped (for convenience) according to the stand taken by the speaker quoted on the subject and an extensive bibliography guides one to further reading.

BIRTH CONTROL. J. E. Johnsen \$2.40. 1925.

CHILD LABOR. J. E. Johnsen \$2.40 1925.

CLOSED SHOP. L. T. Beman. 2d ed. \$2. 1922.

COMMERCIAL ARBITRATION. D. Bloomfield. \$2.40. 1927.

CRIMINAL JUSTICE. J. P. Kirby. \$2.40. 1926.

CURRENT PROBLEMS IN TAXATION. L. T. Beman. \$2.25. 1921.

DEBATERS' MANUAL. E. M. Phelps. New ed. in preparation.

EVOLUTION. E. M. Phelps. \$2.40 1926.

FUNDAMENTALISM VS. MODERNISM. E. C. Vanderlaan. \$2.40. 1925.

MODERN INDUSTRIAL MOVEMENTS. D. Bloomfield \$2.40 1919

PROHIBITION: MODIFICATION OF THE VOLSTEAD LAW. L. T. Beman. \$2.40. 1924.

SLAVONIC NATIONS OF YESTERDAY AND TODAY. M. S. Stanoyevitch. \$2.40 1925.

STATES RIGHTS. L. T. Beman. \$2.40. 1926

STUDY OF LATIN AND GREEK L. T. Beman \$1.80 1921.

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE A. B. Forsberg. \$2.40. 1926.

WAR—CAUSE AND CURE. J. E. Johnsen. \$2.40. 1926.

SERIES II

Cloth. Price \$2.40 each. \$12 for the Series of 6 in one order.

VOL. 1. OLD AGE PENSIONS. L. T. Beman. 1927.

VOL. 2. FEDERAL DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION. J. E. Johnsen. 1927.

VOL. 3. CHINA, YESTERDAY AND TODAY. J. E. Johnsen. 1928

VOL. 4. INTERALLIED DEBTS AND REVISION OF THE DEBT SETTLEMENTS. J. T. Gerould and L. S. Turnbull. 1928.

VOL. 5. INTERVENTION IN LATIN AMERICA. L. T. Beman. 1928.

VOL. 6. NATIONAL DEFENSE. J. E. Johnsen. 1928.

SERIES III

VOL. 1. THE PACT OF PARIS. J. T. Gerould. 1929.

VOL. 2. COMPULSORY AUTOMOBILE INSURANCE. E. L. Bowers. 1929.

VOL. 3. TRENDS IN RETAIL DISTRIBUTION. D. Bloomfield. 1930.

VOL. 4. LAW ENFORCEMENT. J. E. Johnsen. 1930.

VOL. 5. CENSORSHIP OF SPEECH AND THE PRESS. L. T. Beman 1930.

VOL. 6. CENSORSHIP OF THE THEATER AND MOVING PICTURES. L. T. Beman. 1931.

SERIES IV

VOL. 1. DEBATE COACHING. C. P. Lahmann. rev. ed. 1936.

VOL. 2. CHAIN, GROUP AND BRANCH BANKING. V. Willit. 1931.

VOL. 3. RECOGNITION OF SOVIET RUSSIA. Bushler, Maxwell, Pfbaum. 1931.

VOL. 4. CAPITALISM AND ITS ALTERNATIVES. J. E. Johnsen. 1933.

VOL. 5. PROBLEM OF LIQUOR CONTROL. J. E. Johnsen. 1934.

VOL. 6. MINIMUM WAGES AND MAXIMUM HOURS. E. R. Nichols and J. H. Baccus.

UNIVERSITY DEBATORS' ANNUALS

E. M. PHELPS, ED. *Cloth. Price \$2.25*

Series of year books, each a collection of representative intercollegiate debates on important questions of the day. Constructive and rebuttal speeches for both sides. Each debate is accompanied by selected bibliography and briefs.

Vol. XXV. 1938-1939.

The Increase in the National Debt; The Anglo-American Alliance, Government Ownership and Operation of the Railroads, Alliance of United States, France and Great Britain Against Fascism, Have the Achievements of Science Brought Progress?; American Solidarity; The Problem of Unemployment; The American Newspaper; "Pump-priming" Should Cease, Government and Health.

Vol. XXIV. 1937-1938.

Democracy and Economic Prosperity; American Isolation from European Affairs; Protection of United States Citizens on Foreign Soil; Academic Freedom, Grades and Final Tests Subversive of the Aims of Higher Education; American League of Nations; Anglo-American Mutual Assistance Pact; N.L.R.A. and Arbitration of Industrial Disputes, Unicameral Legislatures; Uniform Marriage Laws; Regulation of Advertising.

Vol. XXIII. 1936-1937.

The Constitution a Menace; Government Ownership of Electric Utilities; Subsidizing College Athletes; Teachers' Oaths, Unicameral Legislatures; Economic Internationalism; Minimum Wages and Maximum Hours (two debates), Consumers' Cooperatives, The Present-day Family as a Social Institution; The Sit-down Strike

Vol. XXII. 1935-1936

A Written Constitution a Hindrance to Social Progress; State Medicine; Compulsory Military Training; Legalization of Sweepstakes; Admission of Negroes to State Universities; The Neutrality Policy of the United States; The Parole System; Admission of Hawaii as a State; Limitation of the Power of the Supreme Court (Two debates).

Vol. XXI. 1934-1935.

Equalizing Educational Opportunity; An Evaluation of the New Deal; Social Services and Unemployment Relief; International Traffic in Arms and Munitions; Democratic Collectivism; The Agricultural Adjustment Administration; Collective Bargaining; Government Ownership and Operation of Public Utilities; Pacifism the Highest Form of Patriotism; Japan and Naval Parity.

Vol. XX. 1933-1934.

British System of Radio Control and Operation; Armed Intervention, Japanese Policy in the Far East; A Department of the Consumer in the President's Cabinet, University of Chicago Plan of Education; Economic Reconstruction; Increasing the Powers of the President; Socialized Medicine; Freer Trade; Problem of State Liquor Control.

Vol. XIX. 1932-1933.

Limitation by Law of Gifts, Incomes and Inheritance; Property Taxation for State and Local Revenue; British System of Radio Control; Safety-Responsibility tary Domestic Allotment Plan; Federal Regulation of Electric Power Utilities, Dictatorship Versus Democracy; Capitalism Has Broken Down; Peace Is Impossible Under Capitalism; Stimson Doctrine of Non-recognition of Territory Acquired Thru Violation of Treaties.

Vol. XVIII. 1931-1932.

Russian and American Civilizations; Control of Production and Distribution in Major Basic Industries, Wage Cutting and Business Recovery; Capitalism on Trial; Intervention in the Caribbean; Industrialism vs. Agrarianism for the South; Recognition of Russia; Centralized Control of Industry; Cancellation of International War Debts (two debates)

Vol. XVII. 1930-1931.

The Young Plan; Dominion Status for India, Amateurism vs. Professionalism in College Sports; Repeal of the Eighteenth Amendment; The Machine Age; Free Trade; Reforestation of Farm Lands; Compulsory Unemployment Insurance.

Vol. XVI. 1929-1930.

Foreign Debts and Tariff; Chain Store System; Arbitration of International Disputes; Complete Disarmament; Ontario System of Liquor Control; Censorship; Higher Education for Exceptional Students Only; Cotsworth Thirteen Month Calendar; Oriental vs. Western Civilization.